DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 036 JC 900 057

AUTHOR Kreider, Paul E.; And Others
TITLE The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success in the Community College: Membership Resource Packet.
INSTITUTION Mount Hood Community Coll., Gresham, Oreg.
SPONS AGENCY Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success in the Community Coll., Gresham, OR.
PUB DATE Jun 89
NOTE 71p.; Packet prepared for the 1989 Summer Institute, "Effectiveness and Student Success: Transforming Community Colleges for Success in the 1990's" (Chicago, IL, June 25-27, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Community Colleges; *Consortia; Cooperative Planning; Educational Diagnosis; Educational Testing; Evaluation Methods; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; *Organizational Effectiveness; *Outcomes of Education; Student Attrition; Student Evaluation; *Student Placement; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success in the Community College was established in 1988 to foster programs in support of the teaching and learning process, student retention and success strategies, and institutional effectiveness. Administered at Mt. Hood Community College (MHCC) in Oregon, the consortium currently has 43 member institutions from around the country. This packet of materials contains information on the purposes and organization of the consortium, state-of-the-art reviews on organizational effectiveness and student assessment, and profiles of 22 of the member institutions. Part I presents the consortium's Statement of Purpose, indicating that the organization seeks to: encourage institutional initiative and cooperation; curb excesses driven by assessment and accountability mandates; and provide leadership for national, state, and local efforts toward student success and institutional effectiveness. Part II contains a membership directory providing the names and addresses of steering committee members, chief executive officers of member institutions, and institutional liaisons. Part III is comprised of three articles: (1) "Institutional Learning and Effectiveness," by Paul E. Kreider, which offers an overview of Mt. Hood Community College's efforts to focus teaching, the learning environment, and institutional renewal efforts on student success; (2) "Organizational Effectiveness: The Community College," by Margaret Gratton, which reviews the literature on institutional effectiveness; and (3) "The Role of Assessment," by Linda Gerber, which discusses the student outcomes assessment movement and identifies resources to help community college administrators take a leadership role in shaping the direction of the "effectiveness agenda". Part III includes profiles of the consortium members, providing information on programs and activities pertaining to staff development, student outcomes, student success, and retention. (WJT)

the Consortium
FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS . . .
in the Community College

ED324036

MEMBERSHIP

RESOURCE

PACKET

Contributions by

Dr. Paul E. Kreider, President
Margaret Gratton, Staff and Organizational Development
Dr. R. Dan Walleri, Research & Planning
Mt. Hood Community College

Linda Gerber, Graduate Student
School of Education
Portland State University

and

Members of The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness
& Student Success in the Community College

Prepared for the 1989 Summer Institute, "Effectiveness and Student Success: Transforming Community Colleges for Success in the 1990's, O'Hare Westin, Chicago, Illinois, June 25-27, 1989.

JC900057

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. Kreider

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

June 1989

Mt. Hood Community College

26000 S.E. STARK STREET • GRESHAM, OREGON 97030 • (503) 667-7211)

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MEMBERSHIP RESOURCE PACKET

Prepared for the 1989 Summer Institute, "Effectiveness and Student Success: Transforming Community Colleges for Success in the 1990's, O'Hare Westin, Chicago, Illinois, June 25-27, 1989.

Contributions by

Dr. Paul E. Kreider, President
Margaret Gratton, Staff and Organizational Development
Dr. R. Dan Walleri, Research & Planning
Mt. Hood Community College

Linda Gerber, Graduate Student
School of Education
Portland State University

and

Members of The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness
& Student Success in the Community College

Mt. Hood Community College
26000 SE Stark St.
Gresham, OR 97030

(503) 667-7211

June 1989

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

MEMBERSHIP RESOURCE PACKET

CONTENTS

Introduction 3

I. The Consortium Statement of Purpose 5

II. The Consortium Directory 7

A. Steering Committee 8
B. Chief Executive Officers 9
C. Institutional Liaisons 12

III. "State-of-the-Art" Update 14

A. Institutional Learning and Effectiveness 15
B. Organizational Effectiveness: The Community College 19
C. The Role of Assessment 25
1. State Mandates for Assessment 25
2. Accrediting Association Standards 26
3. Professional Association Activities 27
4. Other Organizations 29
5. Claims For and Against Assessment 31
6. Basic Questions 34
7. Recommendations 37
8. Suggested Readings 38
9. References 43

IV. Profiles of Member Institutions 48

Austin Community College 49
Centralia College 50
Title III Washington State Cooperative Arrangement 51
Clackamas Community College 52
College of Lake County 53
Florida Community College at Jacksonville 54
Jefferson State Community College 55
Johnson County Community College 56
Kalamazoo Valley Community College 57
Lake Michigan College 58
Lakewood Community College 59
Lansing Community College 60
Macomb Community College 61
Mississippi Gulf Coast Community College 62
Mt. Hood Community College 63
Portland Community College 64
Rancho Santiago College 65
Seattle Central Community College 66
Sinclair Community College 67
Tacoma Community College 68
Valencia Community College 69

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Paul Kreider, President
Mt. Hood Community College

The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success in the Community College was officially established in October 1988 at a meeting of community college presidents during the meeting of the Association of Community College Trustees in Louisville. The Consortium concept, however, evolved over several years through collaborative efforts and interactions as the "assessment movement" began to take roots within higher education.

Mt. Hood Community College's involvement grew out of participation with the Kellogg/NCHEMS student outcomes project initiated in 1981. Mt. Hood was one of two community colleges in the first phase of that project. My personal involvement expanded as I served as a consultant for other community colleges that joined subsequent phases of the Kellogg/NCHEMS project. Parallel developments across the nation indicated that community colleges were extending the concept of "access" to address issues involving student outcomes, assessment, retention, and institutional effectiveness. The common concern for all of these colleges was finding means to encourage student success.

The assessment movement continued to expand throughout the 1980s with the evolution of statewide mandates and new regional accreditation requirements. In April 1987 and as a consequence of mutual concerns among colleagues, I proposed that the AACJC Board take a leadership role in focusing attention on student outcomes, including the establishment of a national task force. The proposal entitled, "Seizing the Agenda: Institutional Effectiveness and Student Outcomes for Community Colleges," was presented at the August 7, 1987 meeting of the AACJC board of directors in Seattle, and a revised version was later published in Community College Review, Volume 16, No. 2, Fall 1988.

Although the AACJC has subsequently initiated several efforts in this area, the board decided not to create a national task force. Because of the interest and support of fellow colleagues from across the country, however, The Consortium was born as an alternative to the proposed task force. Although working closely in areas of mutual interest, there is no formal relationship between The Consortium and the AACJC.

At the previously mentioned ACCT meeting in Louisville, CEOs from twenty community colleges met and formed a Steering Committee, established a title for The Consortium, drafted a Statement of Purpose, and began the planning for future activities. The Steering Committee consists of the following CEOs in addition to myself:

John Keyser, Clackamas Community College
Bill Law, Lincoln Land Community College
Al Lorenzo, Macomb Community College
Harold McAninch, College of Du Page

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

George Miller, Amarillo College
Daniel Moriarty, Portland Community College
Anne Mulder, Lake Michigan College
R. Stephen Nicholson, Oakland Community College
Charles Spence, Florida Community College at Jacksonville

Membership is open to any community college and each institution was requested to contribute $100 for "seed money" for printing and postage. The Consortium is administered at Mt. Hood Community College and currently has 43 members representing all areas of the country.

The Consortium is currently involved in two major activities. The first is co-sponsorship with the Community College Consortium of the summer institute entitled, "Effectiveness and Student Success: Transforming Community Colleges for the 1990s," being held in Chicago, June 25-27, 1989. I would especially like to acknowledge and thank Richard Alfred of the Community College Consortium and the University of Michigan for facilitating our co-sponsorship of the summer institute.

Our second activity has been the preparation of this Resource Packet, which includes The Consortium's Statement of Purpose, a membership directory, a "state-of-the-art" review of resource materials and practices involving institutional effectiveness and student success, and membership profiles reflecting activities around The Consortium's theme. It is the Steering Committee's hope that this Resource Packet will assist the membership in developing effective institutional strategies, and provide a foundation upon which The Consortium can shape future activities.

Finally, The Consortium would like to acknowledge all of those who helped in preparing the program for the summer institute and this document. Members of the Steering Committee have been especially supportive in both these endeavors. Richard Alfred, Elizabeth Hawthorne, Kathryn Moore and others from the Community College Consortium were indispensible in organizing the summer institute. Our own members were critical in compiling this document, especially with regard to the institutional profiles. Margaret Gratton and Dan Walleri of Mt. Hood, and Linda Gerber of Portland State University assisted in the compilation, writing, and editing of the entire document. Sheri Mosher of Mt. Hood has and continues to assist with administering the on-going activities of The Consortium.

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Editor's Note: The following page contains The Consortium's Statement of Purpose. The original draft was prepared by Dr. Paul Kreider and was reviewed and revised by The Consortium's Steering Committee. The Consortium welcomes comments on and/or suggestions for further refinement.

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success in the Community College is to foster a strong program in support of the teaching and learning process, student success strategies and institutional effectiveness. The consortium is dedicated to contributing to and providing leadership for national, state and local efforts dealing with institutional effectiveness and student success. The goal is not to establish national or statewide standards but to encourage institutional initiative and cooperation, to provide guidance and support and to curb excesses driven by assessment and accountability mandates.

The consortium will develop understanding of the underlying concepts of institutional effectiveness and the use of outcomes information in program planning and decision making. All aspects of institutional and student life represent a valid basis for assessing outcomes and effectiveness.

Specific purposes include:

* Provide practitioner focus
* Anticipate emerging themes and projects of relevance to institutional effectiveness
* Demonstrate model programs
* Conduct useful research that is action oriented
* Make theory applicable to practice
* Demonstrate use of information in decision making
* Provide training and consultation
* Prepare timely reports, briefs, executive summaries for constituents, and the educational movement
* Promote high quality of scholarship in teaching and learning
* Focus on organizational and staff development
* Develop and demonstrate effectiveness for institutions and students
* Promote organizational health and renewal

GUIDING PRINCIPLES

AACJC Policy on Access
AACJC Policy on Assessment and Outcomes
AACJC Futures Commission Report "Building Communities"

6/89

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

MEMBERSHIP DIRECTORY

Editor's Note: The directory is divided into three parts. First, the members of the Steering Committee are listed in alphabetic order by college. The second listing contains the names and addresses for the CEOs of each member college. The third section contains the names and addresses of the "institutional liaisons" who act on the behalf of the CEOs or their institutions in activities sponsored by The Consortium. A unique feature of The Consortium is its focus on research in support of The Consortium's goals. The institutional liaisons are seen as critical in furthering the research and practice activities of The Consortium.

For corrections and revisions of the directory as well as other membership information please contact:

The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness & Student Success
in the Community College
Dr. Paul E. Kreider, President
Mt. Hood Community College
26000 SE Stark St.
Gresham, OR 97030

(503) 667-7211

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

CONSORTIUM STEERING COMMITTEE

Amarillo College
Dr. George T. Miller, President
PO Box 447
Amarillo, TX 79178

Clackamas Community College
Dr. John S. Keyser, President
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Clackamas, OR 97045

College of DuPage
Dr. Harold D. McAninch, President
22nd Street & Lambert Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Florida Community College at Jacksonville
Dr. Charles C. Spence, President
501 West State Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Lake Michigan College
Dr. Anne E. Mulder, President
2755 E. Napier Avenue
Benton Harbor, MI 49022-1899

Lincoln Land Community College
Dr. William Law, Jr., President
Shepherd Road
Springfield, IL 62708

Macomb Community College
Dr. Albert L. Lorenzo, President
14500 Twelve Mile Road
Warren, MI 48093

Mt. Hood Community College
Dr. Paul E. Kreider, President
26000 SE Stark Street
Gresham, OR 97030

Oakland Community College District
Dr. R. Stephen Nicholson, Chancellor
PO Box 812
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0812

Portland Community College
Dr. Daniel F. Moriarty, President
12000 SW 49th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Amarillo College
Dr. George T. Miller, President
PO Box 447
Amarillo, TX 79178

Austin Community College
Dr. Dan Angel, President
PO Box 2285
Austin, TX 78768

Centralia College
Dr. Henry P. Kirk, President
600 West Locust
Centralia, WA 98531

Chemeketa Community College
Dr. William Segura, President
PO Box 14007
Salem, OR 97309

Clackamas Community College
Dr. John S. Keyser, President
19600 S. Molalla Avenue
Clackamas, OR 97045

Clark College
Dr. Earl P. Johnson, President
1800 McLoughlin Blvd.
Vancouver, WA 98663

College of DuPage
Dr. Harold D. McAninch
22nd Street & Lambert Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

College of Lake County
Dr. Daniel J. LaVista, President
19351 West Washington Street
Grayslake, IL 60030

Collin County Community College Dist.
Dr. John H. Anthony, President
2200 West University
McKinney, TX 75069

Community College of Denver
Dr. Byron McClenney, President
1111 West Colfax
Denver, CO 80204

Dallas County Community College
Dr. Lawrence W. Tyree, Chancellor
701 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75202

Florida Community College at Jacksonville
Dr. Charles C. Spence, President
501 West State Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Greenfield Community College
Dr. Katherine Sloan, President
One College Drive
Greenfield, MA 01301

Guilford Technical Community College
Dr. Ray Needham, President
Box 309
Jamestown, NC 27282

Horry-Georgetown Technical College
Dr. D. Kent Sharples
PO Box 1966
Conway, SC 29526

Jefferson State Community College
Judy M. Merritt, President
2601 Carson Road
Birmingham, AL 35215

Johnson County Community College
Dr. Charles J. Carlsen, President
12345 College at Quivira
Overland Park, KS 66210-1299

Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Dr. Marilyn J. Schlack, President
6767 West O Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49009

Lake Michigan College
Dr. Anne E. Mulder, President
2755 E. Napier Avenue
Benton Harbor, MI 49022-1899

Lakewood Community College
Dr. Jerry Owens, President
3401 Century Avenue
White Bear Lake, MN 55110

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS (cont.)

Lane Community College
Dr. Jack Carter, Interim President
4000 East 30th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97405

Lansing Community College
Dr. Phillip J. Gannon, President
PO Box 40010
Lansing, MI 48901

Lincoln Land Community College
Dr. William Law, Jr., President
Shepherd Road
Springfield, IL 62708

Linn-Benton Community College
Dr. Thomas Gonzales, President
6500 SW Pacific Blvd.
Albany, OR 97321

Macomb Community College
Dr. Albert L. Lorenzo, President
14500 Twelve Mile Road
Warren, MI 48093

Madison Avenue Technical College
Dr. Beverly Simone, Dist. Dir./CEO
3550 Anderson Road, PO Box 14316
Madison, WI 53703-2599

Miami-Dade Community College
Dr. Robert H. McCabe, President
300 NE 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 33132

Mississippi Gulf Coast Junior College
Dr. Barry L. Mellinger, President
PO Box 67
Perkinston, MS 39573

Monroe Community College
Dr. Peter A. Spina, President
PO Box 9720
Rochester, NY 14623

Mt. Hood Community College
Dr. Paul E. Kreider, President
26000 SE Stark Street
Gresham, OR 97030

Oakland Community College District
Dr. R. Stephen Nicholson, Chancellor
PO Box 812
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0812

Oakton Community College
Dr. Thomas Tenhoeve, Jr., President
1600 East Golf Road
Des Plaines, IL 60016

Paducah Community College
Dr. Donald J. Clemens, President
PO Box 7380
Paducah, KY 42002

Portland Community College
Dr. Daniel F. Moriarty, President
12000 SW 49th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

Rancho Santiago College
Dr. Robert D. Jensen, Chancellor
17th at Bristol Street
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Seattle Central Community College
Dr. Charles Mitchell, President
1701 Broadway
Seattle, WA 98122

Sinclair Community College
Dr. David H. Ponitz, President
444 West Third Street
Dayton, OH 45402

St. Louis Community College
Dr. Michael E. Crawford, Chancellor
5801 Wilson Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63110

State Center Community College Dist.
Dr. Bill F. Stewart, Chancellor
1525 East Weldon Avenue
Fresno, CA 93704

Tacoma Community College
Dr. Carleton M. Opgaard, President
5900 So. 12th
Tacoma, WA 98465

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS (cont.)

University of Hawaii Comm. Coll. Sys.
Dr. Joyce S. Tsunoda, Chancellor
2327 Dole Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

Valencia Community College
Dr. Paul C. Gianini, Jr., President
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, FL 32802

Washtenaw Community College
Dr. Gunder A. Myran, President
4800 East Huron River Drive
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

INSTITUTIONAL LIAISONS

Amarillo College
Dr. R. E. Byrd, Vice President/
Dean of Instruction
P.O. Box 447
Amarillo, TX 79178

Austin Community College
Dr. Gwen Rippey, Vice President/
Student and Personnel Services
P.O. Box 2285
Austin, TX 78768

Clackamas Community College
Ms. Lee Fawcett, Assistant Dean
of Students
19600 S. Molalla Ave.
Clackamas, OR 97045

College of DuPage
Dr. Carol Viola, Provost
22nd Street & Lambert Road
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

College of Lake County
Dr. Russell O. Peterson, Dean
Curriculum and Instruction
19351 West Washington Street
Grayslake, IL 60030

Dallas County Community College
Mr. Bill Tucker, Assistant Chancellor
701 Elm Street
Dallas, TX 75202

Florida Community College at
Jacksonville
Dr. Bill Martin, Associate Vice
President
501 West State Street
Jacksonville, FL 32202

Greenfield Community College
Dr. Hyrum H. Huskey, Jr., Dean
Student Affairs
One College Drive
Greenfield, MA 01301

Jefferson State Community College
Dr. Cathryn A. McDonald, Asst. Dean
Instructional Serv. and Assessment
2601 Carson Road
Birmingham, AL 35215

Johnnson County Community College
Dr. Jeff Seybert, Director
Research Eval. and Instr. Dev.
12345 College at Quivira
Overland Park, KS 66210-1299

Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Dr. Richard A. Olivanti, Dean
of College Relations and Services
6767 West O Avenue
Kalamazoo, MI 49009

Lake Michigan College
Dr. Robert Jessen, Director
Institutional Research
2755 E. Napier Avenue
Benton Harbor, MI 49022-1899

Lane Community College
Ms. Julie Aspinwall-Lamberts
4000 East 30th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97405

Lansing Community College
Dr. Dale Herder, Vice President
Administration
P.O. Box 40010
Lansing, MI 48901

Linn-Benton Community College
Jon Carnahan
6500 SW Pacific Blvd.
Albany, OR 97321

Macomb Community College
Dr. Charles Eisenman, Dean
Arts and Sciences
14500 Twelve Mile Road
Warren, MI 48093

Miami-Dade Community College
Dr. John Losak, Dean
Institutional Research
300 NE 2nd Avenue
Miami, FL 33132

Mt. Hood Community College
Dr. R. Dan Walleri, Director
Research, Planning & Adm. Computing
26000 SE Stark Street
Gresham, OR 97030

INSTITUTIONAL LIAISONS (cont.)

Oakland Community College District
Dr. Dan Jaksen, President
Orchard Ridge Campus
P.O. Box 812
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303-0812

Oakton Community College
Dr. Trudy Bers, Senior Director
of Research
1600 East Golf Road
Des Plaines, IL 60016

Portland Community College
Alice Jacobson, Vice President
Planning and Development
12000 SW 49th Avenue
Portland, OR 97219

Rancho Santiago College
Julie Slark, Director
Research and Planning
17th at Bristol Street
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Sinclair Community College
Dr. RoLayne DeStephen
444 West Third Street
Dayton, OH 45402

St. Louis Community College
Dr. John Cosgrove, Director
Institutional Research and Planning
5801 Wilson Avenue
St. Louis, MO 63110

University of Hawaii Community
College System
Dr. Michael Rota, Director
Academic Affairs
2327 Dole Street
Honolulu, HI 96822

Valencia Community College
Dr. Wm. Michael Hooks, Vice President
Planning, Research and Development
P.O. Box 3028
Orlando, FL 32802

"STATE-OF-THE-ART" UPDATE

Editor's Note: At The Consortium's founding meeting in Louisville, October 1988, it was agreed that The Consortium would publish a "state-of-the-art" update with particular focus on assessment. This section seeks to address that intention. The contributors have attempted to frame the issue within the larger context of institutional effectiveness and student success. "Institutional Learning and Effectiveness," by Paul Kreider, is reprinted from Leadership Abstracts, League for Innovation in the Community College (Volume 1, number 19, November 1988). Kreider offers a philosophical basis for the focus on student success and an overview of how this focus has inspired renewal within one institution. In "Organizational Effectiveness: The Community College," Margaret Gratton explores perhaps the most important element in promoting student success: faculty development and vitality in relation to total institutional effectiveness. Finally, Linda Gerber in "The Role of Assessment," provides a comprehensive review of the "assessment movement" with particular attention to the community college. In addition, guidelines and resource materials are provided for administrators and faculty currently involved with or who are considering implementing an assessment program at their colleges.

Interested colleagues are invited to submit reactions to and suggestions for future revision and development of this update.

INSTITUTIONAL LEARNING AND EFFECTIVENESS

Paul E. Kreider

Community colleges have increasingly been called upon by various constituencies to demonstrate that they are effective in performing the distinct and numerous missions that they or others have set for them. Thus, the term "institutional effectiveness" has been popularized, and the term has become an umbrella encompassing a host of related concepts, including accountability, student outcomes, assessment, and various measures of organizational efficiency and vitality.

However, the inextricable connection between institutional effectiveness and institutional learning has seldom been articulated. The corporate literature has recently stressed the importance of organizational learning-that is, the ways in which organizations learn about their environments and ways to operate effectively to fulfill their purposes-particularly in the context of the massive restructuring taking place in the global economic order. In this rapidly changing environment, de Gues argues that "learning is not a luxury, it is how companies discover the future." (Harvard Business Review, March/April, 1988)

It has become apparent that organizations unresponsive to changes in their environments and frozen in unexamined patterns of ineffective behavior will flounder and decline. The literature chronicles the fact that not all organizations learn and adapt, at least not quickly. A full one-third of the Fortune 500 industrials listed in 1970 had vanished by 1983, and two-thirds of all struggling companies fail to recover. The same imperative applies to public community colleges, whose essential survival may be guaranteed in ways that private businesses are not, but whose vitality cannot be assured.

Dysfunctional organizations point out the vulnerability of all human systems. In contrast, the effective maintenance systems of living things that allow them to learn, and thus to adapt and survive, offer an extraordinary model for institutional effectiveness that is based upon institutional learning.

Learning to Know

In the "open system" view, an organization lives in balance with its external environment. Needed resources are taken in, transformed through the fueled energy of the system, and returned to the environment. Key to the process is the internal health, power, energy, and adaptability of all parts of the system. Closed boundaries and inflexible units, within or without, will block the transformational process, leaving the system unable to fulfill its purpose. It is a natural phenomenon that most living systems have built-in devices for knowing how to fulfill their purpose and respond accordingly.

Unfortunately, in human organizations, "learning to know" is most often accomplished through sometimes painful trial and error. This observation provides all the more reason for organizations seeking effectiveness to operate systems for self-study, problem solving, self-correction, and renewal. It is ironic that teaching and learning institutions often do not turn the art of knowing back onto their own systems, processes, and extraordinary human resources.

Theory to Practice

The challenge is to apply theoretical models to actual practice. Mt. Hood Community College has undertaken to achieve institutional effectiveness using an open systems model in which institutional learning is the fundamental process goal. The values that support its efforts and the processes implemented to learn and achieve effectiveness are ones that can be replicated in any community college committed to a similar vision.

All institutional processes have been designed to create a healthy context for functioning effectively as an open system. They have been designed to value the dignity and potential of each person in the organization; all members of the college community are invited to dream, plan, and shape the direction of the organization. All processes are designed to support open communication and the sharing of good data and valid information. Diversity, even conflict, is fostered as a way to clarify issues and tap the best expertise available.

Several examples of these processes illustrate how a commitment to institutional learning can assist a college to achieve institutional effectiveness.

Focus on Student Success

The attempt to assure institutional learning was hastened with the establishment of a task force on student success. Fifty-four representatives from all levels of staff were charged with reviewing all institutional policies and procedures and to recommend improvements to increase the prospects for student success.

Numerous initiatives evolved from the work of the task force and subsequently have taken on a life of their own. These include changes in the college's student information system; new approaches to assessment and placement at entry; a guided studies program for high-risk students; a new monitoring system for the college's standards of academic progress; an early intervention program; a new focus on teaching and learning styles; and major development of institutional support systems, including research, planning, program improvement, budget development, implementation of a new teaching improvement process, small group instructional diagnosis, and a faculty and staff development series.

Assessment and Outcomes

Another major contribution to institutional learning was the college's participation in the Kellogg/NCHEMS Student Outcomes Project, the focus of which was on using outcomes information in program planning and decision-making.

The college's involvement in pioneering efforts in this major reform movement in higher education reinforced a growing sense of institutional pride and purpose. It also made clear that leadership is more concerned about timely and informed involvement in the process of discovery and decision-making than in either control or attainment of some predetermined goal.

The college proceeded on the assumption that every aspect of institutional and student life represented a valid basis for assessing outcomes and effectiveness. It reaffirmed the college's commitment to research on outcomes, including the extensive use of follow-up studies and recognition of the importance of student intentions in determining student success.

Creative Teaching and Learning Environment

At MHCC, the focus on student success has led to the improvement of teaching and learning. Progress has been made in using assessment strategies as an integral part of curriculum development. Intended outcomes are required to be specified as explicitly as possible in the design of curriculum. The course approval process, curriculum review process, program review and approval, strategic planning, and resource allocation processes were all examined and modified as necessary to support the creation of a purposeful teaching and learning environment.

The program improvement process has led to better quality teaching and learning, a focus on outcome measures for student success, and the creative assessment and review of organizational life. This process, combined with focused committee work, has strengthened the comprehensiveness of the curriculum, and the associate degree and general education requirements have been reviewed and enriched.

Staff and Institutional Renewal

There is an increasingly keen recognition at Mt. Hood Community College that the competence and resourcefulness of the staff are key to higher expectations and enthusiasm for institutional learning. As a result, there is strong support for professional development with emphasis upon improving participation, creativity, and effectiveness of all staff to support institutional renewal.

A model program for staff development and participation continues to be quality circles. Groups of employees voluntarily meet to identify, analyze, and solve work-related problems with the help of trained facilitators. Twenty-two staff members have been trained and continue upgrading as quality circle facilitators. Besides finding solutions, quality circles have also

developed individual and group abilities which promote more effective communication and improved teamwork, attitudes, and skills. Participation in decision-making has improved staff morale. Staff performance has also improved, and motivation to learn and increase effectiveness is high.

Mt. Hood Community College's program for institutional effectiveness is based upon five key elements:

1. vision and mission: clearly defined and founded on student success

2. thematic leadership: creating, modeling, and persisting in visible leadership values

3. commitment to staff and organizational approach to teaching, learning, renewal, and vitality

4. valid information and data: open systems for research, diagnosis, feedback, assessment, and organizational knowing

5. integrated institutional systems: strategic planning; program review; budget processes; and multiple, cross-staff, ad hoc teams

The college pursues a vision of an organization energized with new ideas and new possibilities for future development. It seeks to create everyday a vital environment where successful teaching and learning can happen and where the emphasis is squarely upon student outcomes and success.

A recent institutional self-study and accreditation report reaffirmed that the college has a clear sense of direction, a certain reason for being, orderly processes, and sufficient flexibility to allow for redirection to achieve its fundamental goal-providing an exciting and effective teaching and learning community.

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS: The Community College

Margaret Gratton

The network of United States community colleges has been described as the only sector of higher education that can be called a "movement." From their inception, public community colleges have been "the people's colleges," characterized by an open-door policy, comprehensive service, and dedication to classroom teaching. With a broad mission of accessible education for all, the community college system became the place where the less privileged could grasp opportunities that otherwise would be out of reach. In Building Communities, a report from the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges (1988), it is noted that between 1965 and 1975 enrollment at community, technical, and junior colleges grew by 240 percent. Community colleges now enroll 51 percent of all first-time entering freshmen and comprise the largest sector of higher education in the United States. However, in more recent years the phenomenal growth has fluctuated. Resources have dwindled, student intentions and demographics have changed, and community colleges find themselves faced with the challenge of redefinition and the need for planned change strategies.

Building Communities focuses on community college students, curriculum, instruction, leadership, governing boards, and local communities as the key pieces of the community college system, making broad-based recommendations for all areas. Within this context, the Futures Commission especially emphasizes teaching as the central function, "the heartbeat," of the community college educational mission. More importantly, the Commission directly links the vitality of instruction with "energy . . . pumped into the community, continuously renewing and revitalizing the institution" (p. 8). At the same time the Commission points out that on many campuses there is a ". . . feeling of burnout and fatigue among faculty, a loss of vitality, that weakens the quality of teaching" (p. 11). One can conclude then that if teaching is the heartbeat of the institution, a tired faculty will result in an organization lacking vitality. An organization lacking vitality will be hard pressed to fulfill its mission effectively. In short the AACJC Commission on the Future of Community Colleges addressed the issue of organizational effectiveness.

If organization effectiveness is to be achieved, there must be some sense of what it is--what it would "look like."

There is considerable literature which presents characteristic traits and definitions of the effective organization. Some of these definitions are generic; some are prescriptive; and most reflect assumed values about human nature. Early work in the field of organization development provided the foundation for much of the current thinking about effectiveness.

Richard Beckhard (1969) saw the effective organization as one which strives for goals and plans to achieve goals, where form follows function, decisions are made near the source of information, and communication is open.

Conflict is based on issues, not personalities. The organization is an open system; there are shared values, with an emphasis on integrity. The organization and members operate by action research and by feedback systems for enhancement of learning.

An effective organization was described by John Gardner (1965) as one that is self-renewing through recruitment and development of talent; has a hospitable environment for the individual; has provision for self-criticism, maintains fluidity in the internal structure; and has some means of combating those processes which cause "dry rot."

Edgar Schein (1965) talked of the "adaptive coping cycle" by which an organization becomes more dynamic through processing information reliably and validly; encouraging internal flexibility, integration and commitment to goals; and through maintaining a supportive, non-threatening environment.

In his early work in the 1970's, Chris Argyris believed that an effective system must be able to generate valid information, exercise free and informed choices, and generate internal commitment. Fundamental to Argyris' beliefs was the notion of "congruency" throughout the organization, its people, values, and systems.

The complexities of organizational effectiveness have been further sorted out by the contributions of Kim Cameron (1980). Cameron pointed out that criteria for effectiveness will differ from one organization to another, particularly in comparing profit and nonprofit organizations. To accommodate differences, he suggested that effectiveness might be determined by the organization's ability to fulfill goals, to acquire resources, to operate smoothly, or to serve special interest groups in a satisfying way. Each of these capabilities can be seen as a distinct model.

In addition, Cameron and David Whetten (1983) designed evaluative questions to guide research in the determination of organization effectiveness. These questions highlighted the myriad variables to be considered, such as differing domains, time frames, types of data, referents, levels of analysis, and differing purposes for judging effectiveness.

When Cameron examined institutions of higher learning in 1976 and again in 1980, he developed nine major predictors of organizational effectiveness. He used criteria specifically related to institutions of higher learning rather than the generic or universal criteria used to describe all organizations. However, dimensions of universal criteria were included, such as "organizational health" meaning vitality in the internal processes and practices of the organization; and "system openness" related to the organization's interaction with and adaptability to the external environment (1978, 1980). Four of the nine criteria for effectiveness were student centered: student educational satisfaction, and student academic, career, and personal development. Also he included two faculty related dimensions: faculty (and administration) employment satisfaction, and professional development and quality of faculty. Cameron found that for every dimension of effectiveness, the strategic orientation of managers is significantly related to high scores. He found that a "proactive" management approach to faculty development improved effectiveness. At the same time he found that environmental turbulence was negatively associated with improving

effectiveness related to job satisfaction and faculty development. He also noted that unionized institutions were less effective than nonunion. Cameron's work has prompted debate, but it has served to sharpen substantive thinking about colleges and universities as effective organizations.

Throughout the 1980's, the issue of faculty development has been increasingly linked up with the broader view of organizational excellence (George Keller, 1983) and organizational effectiveness (Cameron, 1984, 1986). In Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education (1983), Keller observed,

> Nothing is so important to a college or university as the quality and vigor of its faculty. Yet several new developments threaten to eat like acid into faculty excellence in the future or require new faculty attitudes and practices (p. 22).

The "new developments" refers to the steady state and declining state of faculty locked in by low mobility, tenure investments, and older retirement ages. Keller called for the development of strategic management principles. He echoed Cameron who found that a strategic orientation by managers was related to institutional effectiveness. Woven throughout Keller's work on strategic management was the central issue of human vitality and competence--that growth and development come from ". . . uncovering, stimulating, or enticing people within the organization to bring new fervor and imagination to their tasks" (p. 97). In a 1985 interview R. Eugene Rice said he found that the most exciting colleges, with excited faculty, were those with creative leaders who "empowered" faculty to try new things, reach across disciplines, and connect with the external world (p. 50).

The shared responsibility of the institution and the faculty for both institutional and faculty vitality was emphasized by Shirley Clark, Mary Corcoran, and Darrell Lewis in "The Case for Institutional Perspective on Faculty Development," (1986). They pointed out that much of the staff development work of the 1970's was designed by those who were not faculty members. Programs did not emerge from the faculty on the basis of felt needs and addressed only pieces of the faculty role, not the whole person, the whole career, or the faculty's relationship with the institution. The authors cited Cameron's work to support the interactive aspects of individual and institutional vitality.

Most recently Bland and Schmitz (1988) commented on "faculty vitality" as the new buzz word, replacing faculty development. They indicated that "vitality" implies a larger scope, multiple factors, and "systems-level remedies" (p. 191). In short, the notion of vitality takes on organizational implications for effectiveness.

In the literature dealing with recommendations for vitality, Bland and Schmitz (1988) found a recurring linkage between faculty development and institutional mission. However, they cautioned that although administrative support is critical in creating linkage, that support must be balanced by faculty ownership and involvement in the organizational design for vitality.

Finally, the authors emphasized appropriate funding, and an identified "vitality leader who is highly placed, and who is involved in policy-making and credible, comprehensive planning that integrates individual, departmental, and institutional strategies" (p. 206).

Increasingly, the literature of both staff development and institutional effectiveness focuses on three elements: (1) a shared understanding of the mission within the organization, (2) development of the effectiveness of each individual staff member, and (3) creation of an organization climate that supports the mission by supporting and nourishing the competence and vitality of the staff.

Consideration of institutional effectiveness can become a complexity of abstractions and constructs. In a search for solutions, literature has emerged, offering what Peter Vaill (1989) calls cookbook, five-easy step, quick-fix approaches. Nevertheless scholars such as Cameron have contributed significantly to the sorting out of models, variables and suggested criteria for colleges and universities. The consideration of our institutions as open systems, with staff vitality and competence as the key to organizational vitality and competence, is rooted in much of the corporate excellence and effectiveness literature of 1980's. More and more these models are trying to address major paradigm societal shifts resulting in turbulence, unpredictability, and chaos within and outside of organizations (Gleick, 1987; Peters, 1987; Vaill, 1989). At stake is the vitality and strength of the human spirit to adapt, persist, and flourish in an unstable, fast-paced, ambiguous environment.

When the AACJC Futures Commission on Community Colleges attempted to bring together the many dimensions of concern for community college effectiveness, it resulted in the notion of "building communities." The concept of community was described more as a climate to be created, rather than simply constituencies to be served.

Such a climate would be open, collaborative, cooperative. It would honor and support the human spirit through creation of a community for teaching and learning. To achieve such a climate requires a continual search for the way. Peter Vaill speaks of our reach for ". . . something that pervades, energizes, weaves through, infuses, saturates, . . . our experience" (p. 215) and he concludes "the same spirit does animate the whole." (p. 224)

In conclusion, community colleges share the distinctive common mission of teaching and learning. The strengthening of mission, the nurturing of all human development, and the courage to exercise visionary leadership will serve institutional effectiveness. Faculty and staff development remain key components in the life of the system.

REFERENCES

Argyris, C. (1970). Intervention theory and method: A behavioral science view. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Beckhard, R. (1969). Organizational development: Strategies and models. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bennis, W. G. (1969). Organization development: Its nature, origins, and prospects. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Bland, C., & Schmitz, C. (1988). Faculty vitality on review: Retrospect and prospect. The Journal of Higher Education. 59, (2), 190-224.

Cameron, K. (1978). Measuring organizational effectiveness in institutions of higher education. Administrative Science Quarterly, 23 (4), 609-626.

Cameron, K. (1980). Critical questions in assessing organizational effectiveness. Organizational Dynamics, 9 (2), 66-80.

Cameron, K. (1984, March-April). Organizational adaptation and higher organization. Journal of Higher Education, 55 (2), 122-144.

Cameron, K. (1986). A study organizational effectiveness and its predictors. Management Science, 32 (1), 87-111.

Cameron, K. (1986). Effectiveness as paradox: Consensus and conflict in conceptions of organizational effectiveness. Management Science, 32 (5), 539-553.

Cameron, K., & Whetten, D. (eds.). (1983). Organizational Effectiveness: A comparison of multiple models. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Clark, S., Corcoran, M. & Lewis, D. E. (1986, March-April). The case for institutional perspective on faculty development. The Journal of Higher Education, 57 (2), 176-195.

Commission on the Future of Community Colleges. (1988). Building communities: A vision for a new century. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, National Center for Higher Education.

Eble, K. E., & McKeachie, W. J. (1986). Improving undergraduate education through faculty development. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gardner, J. W. (1965, October). How to prevent organizational dry rot. Harpers Magazine, 231, p. 20.

Gleick, J. (1987). Chaos: Making a new science. New York: Viking Penguin.

Hall, J. (1980). The competence process: Managing for commitment and creativity. The Woodlands, TX: Teleometrics International.

Keller, G. (1983). Academic strategy: The management revolution in higher education. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins.

Peters, T. J. (1987). Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a managerial revolution. New York: Knopf.

Rice, R. E. (1985). Faculty lives: Vitality and change. St. Paul, MN: Northwest Area Foundation Report.

Rice, R. E., & Austin, A.E. (1988, March-April). High faculty morale: What exemplary colleges do right. Changes.

Rice, R. E., & Lovett, C. (1985, September-October). In pursuit of commitment. Change, 17 (4), 45-50.

Schein, E. H. (1965). Organizational Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Vaill, P. (1989). Managing as a performing art. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

The Role of Assessment

Linda Gerber

At the beginning of this decade, the shifting spotlight which popularizes ideas and issues in American society focused on the concept of "excellence" in the business arena. A general dissatisfaction with the quality of American industry and business soon spilled over into the domain of higher education. The public began questioning the value of what it viewed to be the product of education--the knowledge and skills gained by students who engaged in the educational enterprise. This dissatisfaction manifested itself in a series of influential national reports in the middle of the decade which shared several common themes of reform, including demands for curricular revision, for more rigorous academic standards, and for assessment of learning outcomes (Association of American Colleges, 1985; Bennett, 1984; National Governors Conference, 1986; National Institute of Education, 1984). In the view of some, the need for reform grew out of "curricular disarray" of the 1970's; to others, it resulted from a failure of postsecondary education to adapt to the new learning demands of the technological/information age.

The notion of excellence in higher education soon was framed in terms of institutional effectiveness, and educators grappled with defining "effectiveness" in this context. Traditionally, institutional quality in higher education has been based on a college's resources (e.g., library holdings, caliber of faculty, and state of the art technology), reputation (e.g., the ranking of institutions by chief officers of peer institutions), and growth. This approach focused primarily on "input." Astin (1977, 1982) was among the earliest critics of the traditional method of determining quality. Charging that the above criteria failed to scrutinize one of college's primary roles, fostering student learning, he called for redefining "quality" and "excellence" in terms of an institution's ability to promote learning.

Colleges and states now are struggling with issues related to defining and assessing student success. Given this concern, the purpose of this paper is twofold. First, it will provide a general overview of the student outcomes assessment movement. Second, it will direct community college administrators to resources that will assist them in taking a leadership role in shaping the direction of the "effectiveness agenda" and in planning assessment programs for their campuses as one means of increasing effectiveness.

STATE MANDATES FOR ASSESSMENT

State legislatures and boards of public postsecondary systems responded to the demands for evidence of student learning and development with a surge of activity. A 1987 survey of fifty states (Boyer, Ewell, Finney and Mingle, 1987) found at least two-thirds had adopted initiatives that they described as assessment mandates. The remaining states reported little activity in promoting assessment. In six states, mandates emanated from the state legislatures (Florida, Georgia, South Dakota, Tennessee, California, and Colorado). In others, they came from the state boards of education.

Regardless of origination, by far the majority of states with initiatives eschewed statewide testing in their mandates and deferred decisions about the form assessment should take to individual institutions. Typically, initiatives called for colleges to (a) determine and state their own educational goals for students, (b) document progress towards achieving those goals, and (c) report efforts to attain unachieved goals. At the time of the report, about twenty-five states related that their efforts were directed primarily at fostering assessment and providing minimal assessment guidelines for institutions. The remaining ten states imposed more rigorous assessment requirements, all featuring mandated testing to be conducted statewide. Of the former group, some states were more directive, requiring that assessment be included as part of statewide reviews or that institutional assessment plans be formally submitted, while others were less directive, focusing on encouraging assessment activity by offering technical assistance or incentive grants for piloting assessment programs. Some states included intervention requirements aimed at identifying underprepared students prior to enrollment and providing remediation either directly before or shortly after students arrive on campus.

Since 1987, none of the existing initiatives has been dismantled (P.T. Ewell, personal communication, May 16, 1989). Rather, states have continued to refine and implement assessment requirements. For example, the California State Assembly has passed Assembly Bill 1725, which prescribes minimum requirements for a "comprehensive community college accountability system which describes the performance of community colleges in meeting the postsecondary educational needs of students. . .[including] performance data on students, programs, and institutions" (California Community College Faculty, Administrators and Trustees, 1988). All evidence points to continued interest at the state level in holding colleges accountable for student outcomes. Furthermore, there are no signs that states are questioning the utility or feasibility of student outcomes assessment as an important means of judging institutional effectiveness.

ACCREDITING ASSOCIATION STANDARDS

As state legislatures and boards have developed assessment initiatives, postsecondary accrediting associations have followed suit. The Southern Association of Colleges (SAC) was the first of the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) organizations to require evidence of student learning and development as a condition of accreditation. In 1985, SAC produced a major revision of its accreditation standards, which included the statement that institutions "must define [their] expected educational results and describe how the achievement of these results will be ascertained" (SAC, 1985). Many affected colleges reacted with alarm, assuming that specific kinds of data from nationally normed tests would be required of them. To allay these fears and to help colleges develop assessment plans congruent with their own missions and educational goals for students, SAC produced an implementation manual. The manual listed a wide array of kinds of information as appropriate measures of student performance, including (SAC, 1987):

- o student retention and completion rates,
- o student achievement in general education,
- o student achievement in the major field

- o student perceptions of their development toward educational objectives,
- o student affective development,
- o job placement rates, and
- o performance after transfer from 2-year to 4-year institutions.

In 1987, the U.S. Department of Education adopted new guidelines for the approval of accrediting agencies that would require that outcomes assessment be included in each agency's accreditation criteria (Banta, 1988; U.S. Department of Education, 1987). More specifically, the guidelines require that "each accrediting agency must determine whether or not an institution or program (1) maintains clearly specified educational objectives consistent with its mission; (2) documents the educational achievements of its students 'in verifiable and consistent ways'; (3) publicizes for the benefit of prospective students its educational objectives and the results of its assessment procedures; and (4) systematically applies the information obtained through assessment 'to foster enhanced student achievement'" (Banta, 1989).

Currently, all accrediting associations require evidence of student outcomes in some form. Some have followed the SAC and set forth relatively detailed, acceptable approaches to documenting student outcomes; others have stressed utilizing existing criteria and data sources; still others have maintained they have always included some form(s) of student outcomes as a measure of effectiveness. Recently, the Western Association developed two sets of guidelines--one for four-year colleges and another for two-year colleges. Professional associations, which traditionally have been most likely to include outcomes as measures of effectiveness, continue to emphasize their use, especially in the fields of medical technology and engineering technology (P. T. Ewell, personal communication, May 16, 1989).

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC). The growth of the assessment movement is reflected in the increasing prominence assessment has acquired in the public policy statements of the AACJC. In the 1987 comprehensive Public Policy Statement, assessment was mentioned only once, subordinated to the broader goal of promoting access and calling only for the study of exit and testing standards. In April of 1987, a coalition of groups with a special interest in access presented the AACJC Board of Directors with detailed recommendations for improving access and retention (Community, Technical and Junior College Journal, 1987). The American Association of Women in Community and Junior Colleges, the National Community College Hispanic Council, the National Council on Black American Affairs, the National Council of Student Development and others comprised the coalition. This council report (1987) emphasized intervention and included assessment as an important intervention strategy. Adopting most of the council's recommendations, the AACJC issued two detailed policy statements on access and assessment in November 1987. In 1988 the association's comprehensive Public Policy Statement elevated assessment to the position of one of eight major goal areas. Included as objectives under this goal were activities such as working with accrediting agencies on outcomes issues and sponsoring a national round table of experts to develop AACJC assessment policy. In the 1989 Public Policy Statement, assessment again took a prominent place, this time as one of

six major goal areas. The related objectives began to treat the practical aspects of assessment, such as "strengthening the data collection and institutional research capacities of the association and its members" and developing "national indicators of institutional effectiveness."

As these changes were occurring at the policy level, the associations' Commission on the Future of Community Colleges report, Building Communities (1988), also recognized the role of assessment and recommended that "each community college. . .be involved in defining in explicit terms the educational outcomes which the institution aspires to produce for its students. Those outcomes should be clearly related to the mission of the college and to an informed understanding of the educational needs and goals of the college's student population."

The AACJC currently has a three-year Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grant which began in 1988. The purpose of the grant is to design and implement student tracking and assessment systems at ten community colleges with limited institutional research capabilities. Once the grant is completed, the Association anticipates disseminating information in a monograph or book about the most promising practices emerging from this work.

American Association of Higher Education (AAHE). The AAHE, taking an early leadership role regarding assessment, has focused primarily on four-year institutions and has tended to emphasize the use of standardized testing. The first national AAHE Assessment Forum convened in 1985. Each year the forum has grown and addressed an increasingly broad spectrum of issues. One of the forum's major contributions has been to bring together people involved in an array of assessment activities on their own campuses to discuss the practical aspects as well as the larger policy issues of assessment. A directory of approximately thirty of these campus-based assessment programs is included in the AAHE Assessment Forum's Assessment Programs and Projects (Paskow, 1988). The fact that only three of the thirty are at community colleges underscores AAHE's concentration on four-year colleges and universities.

Two other recent AAHE activities are noteworthy. In the fall of 1988, the association co-sponsored a nationally aired teleconference on assessment with the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators and the American College Personnel Association. This spring, AAHE published the first issue of its quarterly Assessment Update: Progress, Trends, and Practices in Higher Education (AAHE, 1989). Assessment Update will feature articles on current issues, a column on state initiatives, campus profiles, reviews of assessment measures, and other information pieces. The first issue contained an insightful discussion of some of the unique difficulties community colleges face as they attempt to devise assessment programs (McIntyre, 1989). For more information, call AAHE at (202) 293-6440.

League for Innovation in the Community College. The League for Innovation, founded in 1968, is a national organization of leading community colleges committed to innovation and experimentation. The League is the only organization of its kind in higher education and plays an important role in stimulating and creating new ideas to improve educational opportunity for students. Membership is by invitation and is kept small in order to ensure an effective working group of colleges.

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

The League sponsored a conference on institutional effectiveness in 1988 and has published a number of papers on assessment, including Guidelines for the Development of Computerized Student Information Systems (League for Innovation, 1984), and Computerized Adaptive Testing (League for Innovation, 1988), a description of computerized testing in three community colleges--Central Piedmont, Santa Fe, and Miami-Dade. In the Fall, the League anticipates completion of a book-length publication aimed, first, at helping community colleges to sort through the issues of outcomes assessment and, second, at outlining practical procedures for constructing an outcomes assessment program. For more information, call the League at (714) 855-0710.

National Center for Higher Education Management (NCHEMS). NCHEMS has also been a leader in the outcomes assessment movement. In cooperation with the Kellogg Foundation, the council assisted in the development of a number of pilot assessment projects at two-year and four-year colleges. Ewell's NCHEMS publications document these efforts and offer a thorough exploration of the issues--both broad and narrow--related to assessment: Information on Students: How to Get It and How to Use It (1983), The Self Regarding Institution (1984), "Assessment, Accountability, and Improvement: Managing the Contradiction" (1987), and Benefits and Costs of Assessment in Higher Education: A Framework for Policy Choice and Comparison (1988). His work, written with clarity and perception, is especially useful in providing a conceptual framework for the study of outcomes assessment. In addition, NCHEMS and the College Board have developed the Student Outcomes Information System (SOIS), a method colleges can use to collect information on students and alumni regarding their attitudes, their satisfaction with their education, their job placement and job success. SOIS features standardized questionnaires and a data analysis service. For more information, call NCHEMS at (303) 497-0390.

OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

The U. S. Department of Education (USDE) . The USDE has encouraged the use of outcomes assessment as a measure of effectiveness in several ways. As mentioned above, it has incorporated student outcomes into the requirements for accreditation. In addition, it has established new grant guidelines for Title III funds aimed at encouraging student assessment and outcomes research. One example of a recently funded Title III project is underway in Washington State where a $2.5 million dollar cooperative grant, administered over five years and involving five community colleges (Centralia, Green River, Tacoma, Shoreline, and Walla Walla) will work to develop assessment and placement strategies, computer-assisted advising, degree-audit systems, and other programs to improve the success of academically underprepared students.

In addition to Title III grants, the USDE has also awarded a number of Fund for The Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grants to assessment based programs. To help colleges develop their assessment expertise, the Office of Educational Research and Improvement has published two resource books on assessment: Assessment in American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts (Adelman, 1986) and Performance and Judgement (Adelman, 1988). (See "Suggested Readings" section of this paper.)

National Center for Research In Vocational Education (NCRVE). NCRVE at Ohio State University in cooperation with the National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges has created an instrument for measuring the institutional effectiveness of community colleges (Grossman and Duncan, 1988). The model upon which the instrument is based, also created at NCRVE, includes six overarching effectiveness domains: access and equity, employment preparation and placement, transfer, partnerships with external bodies, economic development, and cultural/cross-cultural development. Moreover, the model accounts for local differentiation within these domains. For more information, contact Mark Newton, Director, National Alliance of Community and Technical Colleges, (800) 848-4815.

The Consortium for Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success in the Community College. This consortium was formed in 1988 to foster a strong program in support of the teaching and learning process, student success strategies, and institutional effectiveness. The Consortium is dedicated to contributing to and providing leadership for national, state and local efforts dealing with institutional effectiveness and student success. The Consortium's goal is not to establish national or statewide standards but to encourage institutional initiative and cooperation, to provide guidance and support, and to curb excesses driven by assessment and accountability mandates. Major current activities include co-sponsoring the Summer 1989 institute entitled, "Effectiveness and Student Success: Transforming Community colleges for the 1990's," to be held in Chicago June 25-27, 1989. For more information, contact Paul Kreider, President of Mt. Hood Community College, at (503) 667-7211.

National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning (NCRIPTAL). Founded in 1986 at the University of Michigan, NCRIPTAL is a federally funded national center to research and develop ways to improve college education and to share its findings with educators, administrators, policy makers, and the general public.

The Center has drafted position papers and conducted studies in a number of areas related to institutional effectiveness including academic outcomes measures and the role of faculty as a key resource. The NCRIPTAL monographs include Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty (1988) by K. P. Cross and T. A. Angelo (1988), Focusing on Student Academic Outcomes: A Working Paper (1988) by J. M. Alexander and J. S. Stark, and The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Research Literature (1986) by M. W. Peterson, K. S. Cameron and associates. For more information contact, NCRIPTAL at (313) 936-2748.

The Assessment Resource Center. Housed at the University of Tennessee--Knoxville and supported in part by a FIPSE grant, the Center's primary purpose is to disseminate information about successful practices in assessment. Activities include providing bibliographies of assessment instruments and practices, coordinating workshops in which practitioners serve as consultants to other educators interested in beginning or improving their college assessment programs, linking consultants to institutions that seek assistance in their assessment efforts, and coordinating discussion groups to identify and analyze issues related to assessment. For more information contact, Gary Pike or Trudy Banta at (615) 974-3504.

The Classroom Research Project--U. of California, Berkeley. P. K. Cross and T. A. Angelo are working with fifty community college teachers in California, training them to do classroom assessment. As part of this project, a "Teaching Goals Inventory" is being developed, a handbook titled Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty was produced (published by NCRIPTAL), and two other books are in progress. In addition, two instructional models for training community college teachers in classroom assessment techniques have been developed and pilot-tested. It is anticipated that in the future intensive summer session workshops will be offered in classroom assessment for practicing college teachers.

Project Cooperation. Project Cooperation is a collaborative effort by community college educators interested in clarifying the concept of institutional effectiveness. Participants include a variety of community college professional associations and interest groups. Project Cooperation sponsored a national colloquium, "Institutional Effectiveness via Outcomes Assessment," held July 1988 at Howard Community College in Columbia, Maryland. For more information, contact Walter G. Bumpus, Vice President and Dean of Students at Howard Community College, (301) 992-4809.

CLAIMS FOR AND AGAINST ASSESSMENT

It is clear, based on the activities outlined above, that the student outcomes assessment movement is growing and is becoming entrenched. In many states, pivotal decisions now are being made which will profoundly affect the community college. It is crucial that community colleges take a strong leadership role in determining the direction of these decisions. Such a role demands a solid understanding of assessment systems and issues (Kreider and Walleri, 1988).

The benefits of assessment. The assessment movement was initially driven by claims that it would give students, faculty, administrators, and college trustees useful information on what students are learning, how well they are learning, and by what means the learning was achieved (Warren, 1987). Its application to community colleges was encouraged by Astin (1983) as a way of strengthening the community college transfer function. In the intervening years, the experiences of individual colleges have allowed for more sophisticated analyses of the benefits of assessment and have surfaced some unexpected merits.

Two of the claims made for assessment relate directly to the performance of individual students. First, proponents argue that assessment can improve student learning by determining student competencies and providing detailed feedback about knowledge and skill levels. This was one of the principle positions taken in Involvement In Learning (National Institute of Education, 1984). Competency assessment improves learning because it allows for placing students in appropriate courses and providing remediation when necessary. Second, assessment is useful as a means of certifying the accomplishments of students. Typically in this form of assessment, the knowledge and skills of students are determined through testing at the time of program completion. This kind of quality control is most evident in licensing and certification examinations in the professions and technical fields. Competency can be assessed through means other than standardized testing,

however. Alverno College's assessment program, for example, is used to certify student achievement as well as to provide feedback to students and instructors for diagnostic purposes (Assessment Resource Center, 1988).

On the organizational level, three claims are made for assessment. First, assessment of student learning can be part of the process of "academic introspection" (Ewell, 1984; Rossman and El-Khawas, 1987). By examining student learning as evidenced through assessment, institutions can identify their strengths and weaknesses in carrying out their fundamental role--promoting student learning. It is argued that this process should be fundamental to strategic planning (Ewell and Lisensky, 1988). Academic introspection can focus on the program level and be used to improve curriculum and programming for students. In the experience of several institutions, improvement can come in the form of strengthening core requirements, changing sequencing of classes, adding "across the curriculum" skill development programs, and altering the content of key classes (Banta, 1985; Ewell, 1984; Jaschick, 1985; and McClain and Krueger, 1985). Moreover, Cross (1976) argues for focusing assessment directly at the classroom level as a means of improving teaching and learning.

A second organizational benefit was identified in a recent study involving in-depth interviews with faculty who have participated in designing assessment programs in those states with mandates. Hutchings and Reuben (1988) report a renewed sense "that teaching matters" and a stronger perception of faculty cohesiveness emerging from these activities. The respondents described gradual changes in the climates of their colleges as decision-making throughout the institutions came to be framed in terms of consequences to teaching and learning. Finally, a third organizational benefit of assessment is that it allows institutions or individual programs within an institution to document their accomplishments related to student achievement. This utility becomes increasingly important as institutions prepare for accreditation studies (Ewell and Lisensky, 1988).

The Hazards of Assessment. While the claims for assessment have been persistent and conspicuous, many educators have cautioned against embracing assessment without careful thought to the limitations inherent in many forms of outcomes assessment and to policy implications underlying assessment. Foremost among these limitations is the difficulty in identifying, defining, and accurately measuring the educational objectives of postsecondary education (Baird, 1988). To date, most assessment strategies have been formulated for "the relatively homogeneous and traditional student populations served by four-year colleges and universities" (Kreider and Walleri, 1988).

Assuming that the technical measurement problems can be overcome, an additional problem lies in the difficulty of gaining a consensus among the faculty about the learning objectives of any single institution. At the community college, coming to agreement about learning objectives is compounded by the diversity of its students and the multiplicity of its mission. Community college educators are concerned that adopting too narrow a range of educational objectives to assess, whether they are imposed from external bodies or arrived at by the faculty, could have harmful consequences. Educators cite fears that the curriculum will be narrowed, that teachers will begin "teaching to test," or that programs and courses that do not directly foster the stated objectives will be cut. They warn that instructors may be

encouraged to abandon teaching higher order thinking as they concentrate on teaching the lower order thinking skills that are more easily described and measured. Given this complexity, community colleges rightly fear the consequences of any state-mandated assessment requirements that would not correspond to the unique mission or student body of their particular colleges.

The community college's historical commitment to access may also be threatened by assessment efforts, especially if they serve a gatekeeper function, such as limiting enrollment to higher levels of education or restricting entry into particular disciplines. This threat is magnified in instances of state-wide testing. If institutions are penalized or rewarded (or even compared with other institutions) on the basis of outcomes assessment results, one consequence may be to limit the access of underprepared students. By limiting admission of students who lack basic academic skills, an institution can effectively control for the skill level of its graduates; however, the consequences to the "open door" could be dramatic (Krieder and Walleri, 1988).

One example will serve to illustrate this problem in practical terms. In Florida, where one of the most restrictive state assessment mandates has been adopted, the comprehensive assessment legislation requires all students to pass the College-Level Academic Skills Test (CLAST) to receive an associate's degree and to advance or transfer to upper division status. Passing scores were raised for 1989. Based on student performance in 1986-87, "it is projected. . . that only twenty-five percent of Hispanic and fourteen percent of black students will be eligible to enroll in upper division courses" (Paskow, 1988). Miami-Dade's President McCabe, among others, has expressed concern that relying on CLAST as the only predictor of upper division college success is a mistake that may result in grave consequences for minority students (Ciereszko, 1987). Community college leaders have a particular stake in analyzing assessment proposals in terms of their effects on the admission, access to programs, transfer, and certification of minority students.

Critics also warn that assessment projects, even at their most benign, may be wasted efforts with little linkage between the assessment activities and teaching and learning or the institutional planning processes at a college. In their rush to demonstrate accountability to outside stakeholders, some institutions have failed to adequately build in utilization of the information acquired through assessment (Kinnick, 1985). Ewell (1986) reports that one common objection to assessment is that it may be "technically infeasible, excessively costly, and [may] divert institutional attention from other more important activities".

Finally, there is mounting evidence that the instruments used in mandated standardized testing may not be sensitive enough to capture specific learning or learning growth. Two recent studies illustrate this problem. The Learning, Assessment, Retention Consortium (LARC) recently concluded the second phase of a three stage research project investigating, in part, whether remedial reading students enhance their reading skills as measured by pre/post reading tests. Twenty-eight California community colleges participated, testing 3,770 students, using appropriate forms of either the Stanford Diagnostic Tests, or the New Jersey Basic Skills Competency Test. The investigators found "the tests used did not reflect the wide range of the

reading curricula and course levels and consequently were not sensitive to skills gain at all levels" (Slark, 1988). This testing problem became magnified when more complex reading skills were under examination.

A recent study, commissioned by the Washington State Higher Education Coordinating Board, sought to examine the validity and usefulness of three widely used standardized tests of communication, computation, and critical thinking (Gill et al., 1989). Specifically, a statewide task force was charged with evaluating the tests in terms of their appropriateness for strengthening college curricula, improving teaching and learning, and communicating accountability data to external stakeholders. The tests being studied were the Academic Profile, the ACT-College Outcome Measures Program, and the Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency. While acknowledging the high quality of the tests for purposes of determining basic aptitude, the study concluded that all of the tests failed to meet reasonable standards for validity and usefulness for the purposes stated above. The investigators found that the tests measure the same verbal and computational aptitude as college admissions tests (e.g. SAT) and that using one of the tests as a sophomore level test would be equivalent to retesting students using an admissions test. The test scores, moreover, are highly correlated to students' abilities at the time they enter college and, thus, seem more appropriate for measuring the abilities of entering freshmen. The tests did not add a significant amount of new information about students' academic abilities or performance to the data already available from admissions tests and student grades. Moreover, the tests have little usefulness for curriculum improvement purposes because they do not measure separate academic skills but instead measure general aptitude. Finally, the study found no evidence that a relationship existed between students' college experiences (e.g., hours spent studying, pattern of coursework) and test results.

Given these kinds of problems with standardized testing, Warren (1988) reports a "retreat from external test development. . .and a tendency among neighboring institutions to pool assessment efforts. Collaboration can lead to better specification of instructional objectives and more accurate assessment." Moreover, many colleges that seek to assess students for the purposes of curriculum improvement have turned to faculty designed tests.

BASIC QUESTIONS EXAMINED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF ASSESSMENT PLANS

Colleges have begun assessment efforts on their campuses as a result both of the external pressures to assess and in response to the achievements some colleges have reported in improving student success through assessment programs. Some institutions began early and have well-developed, institutionalized programs. Others are in the first stages of planning or implementing plans. Regardless of the maturity of their undertaking, in order to shape an effective assessment program, each institution has had to examine a basic set of questions that can be summarized as follows: Why assess? What to assess? Who to assess? Where to place responsibility for assessment? and, How to pay for assessment? The answers to these questions, in turn, gave shape and direction to the resulting assessment plans.

Determining the Purpose of Assessment. Assessment in higher education has traditionally had four purposes: (a) to certify student competencies, (b)

to place students in courses, (c) to evaluate programs and curriculum, and (d) to evaluate institutional effectiveness (Millman, 1988). When assessment is used to judge quality or effectiveness, it is a type of summative evaluation. When linked to program improvement efforts, assessment is a type of formative evaluation. Of the four purposes listed above, all can be formative if the data they produce are used to identify and remediate student, program, or institutional weaknesses. In addition to choosing the purposes of assessment, a college that elects to measure students' knowledge, skills and attitudes at the completion of their college program must decide whether it is most useful to do exit-only testing or to undertake value-added/talent-development testing, which measures achievement gain or attitude change over time. (See Astin's "Assessment, Value-Added, and Educational Excellence" [1987] for an excellent discussion of the merits of value-added assessment.) Colleges are advised to clearly articulate the purposes of their assessment efforts to both internal and external constituencies.

Identifying Outcomes to Assess. A number of taxonomies organizing and defining the outcomes of higher education have been proposed. A classification system developed by Lenning and associates (1977) at the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) is perhaps the most detailed and thorough. However, Astin's (1974) taxonomy is most frequently cited in assessment studies because of its simplicity and comprehensiveness. Astin's taxonomy classifies outcomes on the basis of three dimensions: (a) type of outcome, which is broken into two groups--cognitive or affective, (b) manner of gathering data, which is also dichotomous--either behavioral and obtained through direct observation or psychological and obtained inferentially through testing, and (c) time of capturing data, which again is dichotomous--either short-term and measured during the college experience or long-term and measured after leaving college.

In deciding which outcomes to target in an assessment effort, special attention should be paid to the specific mission and goals of the individual institution. Blasi and Davis (1986) describe a model for linking assessment measures to the four goals traditionally found in community college missions statements: providing education for success in current or future employment or in continued educational undertakings; promoting personal, non-academic growth; providing for community needs that are not directly related to the academic arena; and maintaining accessibility. Their model suggests an array of quantitative and qualitative measures that can be adopted to assess objectives falling under these broad mission goals.

Determining the Unit of Analysis. Assessment can be directed at one or more loci or units of analysis (Alexander and Stark, 1988; Ewell, 1987). The first unit is the individual student. The student is the locus of analysis in an assessment program that diagnoses a matriculating student's skill level and places him or her in appropriate courses or remediation programs. This is also the unit of analysis when individual students are certified for professional licensing. The second unit of analysis is the course/curriculum/program level and is the locus when the aggregate scores of students are examined and recommendations for improving the course, curriculum or program are based on these aggregate results. The third unit of analysis is the institutional level. An example of analysis at this level can be seen in the Florida and Georgia state mandates in which the overall effectiveness of the institution is evaluated in terms of the outcomes of an aggregate group

of students (usually a representative sample). Decisions about the unit of analysis will determine in part whether all students or only a sample of students will be assessed and what kinds of measures are appropriate to use.

Making Decisions about the Organization. If an institution chooses to develop an institutional effectiveness plan which includes student outcomes assessment, a number of organizational decisions must be made. Some relevant questions related to responsibility include (Alexander and Stark, 1988): Who will be responsible for planning and implementing the project? Who will be responsible for collecting data? Who will be charged with making evaluative decisions about the collected data? Who will be responsible for making decisions about how to use the data? Deciding where these responsibilities fall within an organization can be difficult according to Ewell (1989) because "implementing a successful assessment program requires a fusion of three quite different activities. . .teaching. . .research. . .and administrative activity." As a result, it is important to clearly establish organizational roles and responsibility. Once responsibilities have been determined, a second organizational problem involves determining where to begin assessment efforts. Most colleges have begun modestly, piloting assessment programs and targeting their efforts at programs whose faculties are most likely to be receptive to the concept of outcomes studies.

Determining Costs. There is as yet little in the literature treating the costs of student outcomes assessment programs. Two articles, however, suggest ways of analyzing costs to a college. Lewis (1988) states that the costs of assessment must be weighed against "the value of information to managerial decision making....the basic question concerns the amount of resources that a decision maker should allocate in the search for information." He proposes a schema for identifying the costs and benefits of an assessment project. Costs include fiscal and non-budgetary resources as well as opportunity costs, such as faculty involvement which reduces teaching time. Colleges in the decision-making stage regarding assessment can refer to Ewell and Jones' "The Costs of Assessment" (1986), which provides a useful framework for determining what the fiscal costs would be to their institutions. They begin with a consideration of the institution's data collection costs before constructing a formal outcomes assessment program and urge institutions to capitalize on the information already available to them. They break down cost elements into expenditures for instruments, administration, analysis, and coordination, discussing each in some detail. They then present case examples of the estimated costs that would be incurred by typical assessment programs at four types of institutions, including a medium-sized community college.

Making Decisions about Measurement. While assessment is not always about testing, it is always about measurement. As an institution arrives at a purpose for assessment, identifies a set of cognitive and affective outcomes objectives, and determines the organizational structure within which its assessment efforts will operate, it can begin to examine the best means of measuring the achievement of its objectives. Some of the alternatives include: (a) retention, graduation, and transfer studies, (b) basic skills testing, (c) knowledge and skill testing focusing on general education or the departmental major, (d) surveys of student and alumni satisfaction, and (e) surveys of employer satisfaction. The key to good measurement, of course, is achieving clarity about the college's educational objectives for students and

linking assessment efforts directly to those objectives. In many instances, nationally normed, standardized tests are not the best measures of achievement.

A thorough discussion of the issues of measurement is beyond the scope of this paper. There are several good resources available to inform and guide planners. (See the "Suggested Readings" section of this paper.)

RECOMMENDATIONS TO COLLEGE PRESIDENTS AND OTHER EDUCATORS EMBARKING ON ASSESSMENT INITIATIVES

As the decade has unfolded, colleges across the country have implemented assessment programs and advised state level decision-makers on assessment issues. We have arrived at the point where we can begin to speak of a collected wisdom related both to assessment planning and implementation and to working with state boards, legislatures and coordinating agencies.

Those practitioners and theorists who have the longest history of work in the field offer the following advice to educators (Banta, 1988; Ewell, 1985, 1987; and Halpern, 1987):

- o Clarify the purposes of assessment.
- o Include faculty participation in planning and implementation.
- o Establish a planning procedure for assessment that is congruent with the college's planning procedure.
- o Identify specific outcomes goals that reflect the unique mission of the institution and link assessment to these goals.
- o Create a visible assessment center to provide coordination and control of the effort and to demonstrate the college's commitment to improving student outcomes.
- o Provide financial support and other resources.
- o Aim for coordinated and campus-wide assessment but begin with small-scale pilot projects to determine the best strategies and to build trust.
- o Don't reinvent the wheel, but don't buy wheels that don't fit either. Look at model programs but adapt your choices to your college's unique mission, students, and organizational structure/climate.
- o Focus your assessment by targeting special problems related to your college's main goals for students which might be answered through assessment.
- o Account for students' educational intentions when designing assessment systems and identifying outcomes goals.

- Use multiple measures and gather information at a variety of points in time, including during the student's community college education.

- Examine the data you are already collecting and analyze how it will contribute to your assessment efforts.

- Recognize that sound instruments may not exist for assessing some affective outcomes such as self-esteem, tolerance for diversity, and creativity. (As Pat Hutchings says, "assessment doesn't mean measuring everything that moves.")

- Focus on the utilization of assessment results. Identify ways they will be used in decision making and package results in ways that are understandable and useful to faculty and administrators.

In terms of influencing decision-makers at the state level, these professionals suggest that educators:

- Become knowledgeable about assessment systems and issues and the assessment debate in their state.

- Press for flexibility in any proposed mandates so colleges can select goals, strategies, and measures that best reflect their own missions.

- If timelines are to be set, urge that colleges be given sufficient time to explore options and to design their assessment system to avoid "quick fix" plans. Short timelines can force colleges to select easy-to-purchase, easy-to-use assessment instruments that may not be their best choices.

- Press for the realization that process is as important as data results. In other words, help decision-makers understand that one of the greatest contributions assessment can make to an institution is in focusing faculty attention on areas that need improvement and in serving as a catalyst for institution-wide discussion and change.

- Propose that special funding be allocated by the state for assessment, especially at start-up time.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Much has been written about institutional effectiveness and student outcomes assessment. The following resources provide a theoretical framework and untangle the larger issues related to effectiveness and assessment. Many also address the practical aspects of designing and implementing an outcomes assessment process. The resources were selected first with an eye to their applicability to the community college. Although they were not all written with the community college specifically in mind, they do all meet the second selection criterion; that is, they share the common perspective that any effectiveness program must be congruent with the unique features of the individual institution in which it will function. The author is indebted to G. Pike for his suggestions.

Background Resources on Institutional Effectiveness and Evaluation

Grossman, G. M. and Duncan, M. E. (1988). Assessing the Institutional Effectiveness of Community and Technical Colleges. Columbus, OH: National Center for Research in Vocational Education, Ohio State University.

The "Alliance Model of Institutional Effectiveness," developed at Ohio State University, is described in this monograph. The authors include an instrument that can be used by institutions as an evaluation tool. The application of the Alliance model at a number of two-year colleges is also described.

Miller, R. I., ed. (1988). Evaluating Major Components of Two Year Colleges. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.

This collection of articles sets forth the role of evaluation in community colleges and provides models for assessing its various components (students, faculty, academic and student services programs, administrative performance, and external relationships). The role of student outcomes assessment is a recurrent theme throughout the articles.

General Background Resources on Student Outcomes Assessment

Adelman, C., ed. (1986). Assessment in American Higher Education: Issues and Contexts. Washington, DC: USDE/OREI.

This volume introduces current educational and political issues and methodologies related to assessment. Two chapters, "Assessing Outcomes in Higher Education" by John Harris and "The Costs of Asessment" by Peter T. Ewell and Denis P. Jones, are particularly useful.

Banta, T. W., ed. (1988). Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Peril. New Directions for Institutional Research, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

As the title suggests, this monograph includes articles that take a critical look at outcomes assessment issues. Included are articles on organizational leadership and change as it impacts assessment at a college (R. I. Miller and P. T. Ewell), discussions of measurement problems and some solutions to those problems (G. R. Hanson, O. T. Lenning, and J. Warren).

Bowen, H. (1977). Investment in Learning. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Investment is a classic in the literature of assessment. In it, Bowen treats the topics of efficiency and accountability and the purposes of higher education. He also attempts "to build a bridge linking the world of higher education research to higher education policy" (p. xiv).

Bray, D. and Belcher, M. J., eds. (1987). Issues in Student Assessment. New Directions for Community Colleges, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The contributors to this volume discuss the broad issues of assessment in the community college (e.g., "The Impact of Assessment on Minority Access" by Roy McTarnaghan and "Expansion, Quality, and Testing in American Education" by Daniel P. Resnick) as well as practical problems associated with assessment (e.g., "Accommodating Testing to Disabled Students" by Emmett Casey).

Ewell, P. T. (1989). Outcomes, assessment, and academic improvement: in search of usable knowledge. In J. C. Smart Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research, Vol. IV. New York: Agathon Press.

Ewell here examines the research literature on student outcomes from the perspective of academic policy. Of particular interest are two strands of research and theory--one related to students' experiences at college and the effect of those experiences on outcomes, the other exploring outcomes assessment as a "change agent" within an institution. He also develops in this work a conceptual scheme for identifying points of intervention in the policy-making process at which policy affecting outcomes can be manipulated.

Ewell, P. T. (1984). The Self-Regarding Institution: Information for Excellence. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

This is a good beginning place for the educator who has just developed an interest in outcomes assessment. Ewell presents a typology of educational outcomes and discusses the purposes of assessment. He outlines the characteristics of a successful institutional assessment system and relates three examples of notable and now well-known programs at Alverno, Northeast Missouri State, and the University of Tennessee--Knoxville.

Halpern, D. F., ed. (1987). Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The authors included in this work argue the case for assessment and describe model assessment programs, one of which is located at a community college (Miami-Dade).

Resources on Measurement and Instrumentation

Adelman, C., ed. (1989). Performance and Judgment: Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Student Learning. Washington, DC: USDE/OERI.

This work explores concepts and issues related to measuring outcomes. It is substantive and yet accessible to non-psychometricians. As the introduction states, it is "a series of essays examining psychometric and allied issues in the major target curriculum areas of assessment (basic skills, general education, and the major), in emerging

assessment methodologies (performance assessment and computer interactive testing), and in the assessment of major non-cognitive areas of student growth."

Assessment Resource Center (1989). Bibliography of Assessment Instruments. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

In addition to a bibliography, this work surveys the commercially available assessment instruments typically used to assess general education, basic skills, cognitive development, departmental majors, values, and behavioral outcomes such as involvement, persistence and satisfaction. For each instrument, a brief bibliography of related articles is individually referenced.

Assessment Resource Center (1988). Material on Locally Developed Tests. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

A collection of previously published articles that explore how faculty-created tests have been constructed and for what purposes.

Bray, D. and Morante D. (1987). A primer on placement testing. In D. Bray and M. Belcher (Eds.) Issues in Student Assessment. New Directions for Community Colleges, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This article summarizes the general issues underlying placement testing and inventories typical placement testing strategies employed at community colleges.

Lenning, O. T. (1988). Use of noncognitive measures in assessment. In T. W. Banta (Ed.) Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lenning suggests a wide array of strategies for assessing non-cognitive outcomes.

Pace, C. R. (1979). Measuring Outcomes of College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

In this book, Pace laid the foundation for much of the work which has been done in the last decade related to outcomes assessment. He looked at fifty years worth of studies which had measured college outcomes. While not specific to community colleges, this book provides a review of assessment work prior to the 1980's and underscores the fact that outcomes assessment has been with us for a long time.

General Resources on Designing and Implementing Outcomes Assessment Programs

El-Khawas, E. and Rossman, J. E. (1987). Thinking about Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education and American Association for Higher Education.

This is an insightful discussion about the role assessment can play in strategic planning, recruitment and accreditation studies. The authors

offer a number of caveats, particularly concerning the imperative for accurate information and for balancing assessment with other goals. The authors set forth specific actions a president or chief academic officer might take to embark on an assessment project. They also suggest some reasons a college might not be ready for assessment.

Ewell, P. T., ed. (1985). Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

This monograph furnishes an overview of a wide range of research activities that fall under the rubric 'student outcomes assessment.' The contributors offer "basic technical advice about the design of particular types of studies."

Jacobi, M., Astin, A, and Ayala, F., Jr. (1987). College Student Outcomes Assessment: A Talent Development Perspective. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

This work is a comprehensive discussion of cognitive outcomes assessment. It provides an overview of the goals of cognitive assessment, the issues related to measurement in this area, review of the twenty-five "best" (in the authors' opinions) commercially available instruments. The authors also recommend steps for increasing the utility of assessment research.

Kinnick, M. K. (1985). In P. T. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kinnick discusses the variety of roles student outcomes information can play in decision-making and the obstacles that often prevent the use of information, including organizational and technical impediments. She offers explicit recommendations for increasing the likelihood that outcomes information will be effectively communicated and used in decision-making.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (1987). Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness. Atlanta, GA: The Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

This is an excellent guide to developing and documenting an instutional effectiveness plan. It suggests ways of integrating assessment into a general planning and evaluation system and of managing the process. It also gives examples of colleges that have applied this approach.

Resources on Model Outcomes Assessment Programs

Assessment Resource Center (1988). Strategies for Assessing Outcomes. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

A compilation of journal articles, program descriptions, and other materials describing four well-established assessment programs. The programs, at Alverno College, Miami-Dade Community College, Northeast

Missouri State College, and the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, represent distinctive approaches to assessment.

League for Innovation in the Community College (1988). Computerized Adaptive Testing: The State of The Art in Assessment at Three Community Colleges. Laguna Hills, CA: League for Innovation.

This report describes how microcomputers are used as an assessment tool at three community colleges, Central Piedmont, Santa Fe, and Miami-Dade. It also includes a "summary of insights" gleaned from the colleges' experiences with computerized adaptive testing and suggests guidelines for colleges choosing to explore this method of assessment.

Paskow, J., ed. (1988). Assessment Programs and Projects: A Directory. Washington, D.C.: AAHE.

Paskow compiles brief profiles of thirty college assessment programs which represent a sampling of the range of current efforts. For each entry the college is described, the purpose of the assessment is stated, the circumstances that gave rise to the efforts are discussed, and the key features of the program are addressed. In addition, the impact and future direction of assessment at each college also is discussed. Technical information regarding strategies, instruments, and costs is included. For the college searching for models, a useful feature is a listing of printed material available from each profiled college program and the name of a contact person at each campus. Three of the colleges included are community colleges.

Vaughn, G. B., and Templin, R. G., Jr. (1987). Value added: Measuring the community college's effectiveness. Review of Higher Education, 10, pp. 235-245.

The authors recommend a "value-added" approach to assessment at the community college, presenting a system at Piedmont Virginia Community College as a model. They argue that the Piedmont model offers a way community colleges "can deal effectively with the current debate on quality and access." This article was awarded the 1989 AACJC Presidents Academy Best Publication.

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. M. and Stark J. S. (1988). Focusing on Student Academic Outcomes: A Working Paper. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (1988). Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

American Association of Higher Education (1989). Assessment Update: Progress, Trends and Practices in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

American Association of Women in Community and Junior College and other AACJC Councils (1987). Access, Assessment, and Developmental Education in the Community College, Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 57 (6), pp. 38-41.

Assessment Resource Center (1988). Strategies for Assessing Outcomes. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee.

Association of American Colleges (1985). Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Astin, A. W. (1983). Strengthening the transfer programs. In G. B. Vaughn (Ed.) Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1979). Student-oriented management: a proposal for change, Evaluating Educational Quality: A Conference Summary. Washington, DC: Council on Postsecondary Accreditation.

Astin, A. W. (1974). Measuring the outcomes of higher education. In H. R. Bowen (Ed.) Evaluating Institutions for Accountability. New Directions for Institutional Research, 1. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. W. (1968). Undergraduate achievement and institutional excellence. Science. 161: 661-668.

Baird, L. L. (1988). Diverse and subtle arts: assessing the generic academic outcomes of higher education. In C. Adelman (Ed.) Performance and Judgment: Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Student Learning. Washington, DC: USDE/OERI.

Banta, T. W. (1988). Assessment as an instrument of state funding policy. In T. W. Banta (Ed.) Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banta, T. (1985). Use of outcomes information at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. In P. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Bennet, W. J. (1984) To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Humanities.

Blasi, J. F. and Davis, B.S. (1986). Outcomes evaluation: a model for the future, Community College Review, 14, (2) 53-57.

Boyer, C. M., Ewell, P. T., Finney, J. E., and Mingle, J. R. (1987).

Assessment and outcomes measurement: a view from the states, AAHE Bulletin, March, pp. 8-12.

Ciereszko, A. A. (1987). Mandated testing in Florida: a faculty perspective. In D. F. Halpern (Ed.) Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions in Institutional Research, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P. (1979). Accent on Learning: Improving Instruction an Reshaping the Curriculum. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cross, K. P. and Angelo, T. A. (1988). Classroom Assessment Techniques: A Handbook for Faculty. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Ewell, P. T. (May 16, 1989). Personal communication.

Ewell, P. T. (1988). Benefits and Costs of Assessment in Higher Education: A Framework for Policy Choice and Comparison. Report prepared for the State of Arizona, Task Force on Excellence, Efficiency, and Competitiveness. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Ewell, P. T. (1987). Establishing a campus based assessment program. In D. F. Halpern (Ed.) Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ewell, P. T. (1986). The state role in assessing college outcomes: policy choices and probable impacts. In Time for Results: The Governors' 1991 Report on Education--Task Force on College Quality: Supporting Works. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

Ewell, P. T. (1985). Some implications for practice. In P. T. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ewell, P. T. (1984). The Self-Regarding Institution: Information for Excellence. Boulder, CO: National Council of Higher Education Management Systems.

Ewell, P. T. (1983). Information on Students: How to Get It and How to Use It. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Ewell, P. T., and Jones, D. P. (1986). The costs of assessment. In C. Adelman (Ed.) Assessment in American Higher Education. Washington DC: USDE/OERI.

Ewell, P. T. and Lisensky, R. P. (1988). Assessing Institutional Effectiveness: Redirecting the Self-Study Process. Washington, DC: Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education.

Gill, J. and associates (1989). A Statewide Study of Standardized

Assessment Instruments: An Example of Cooperative Inquiry in the Washington State Higher Education System. Report presented at the Association for Institutional Research, Twenty-ninth Annual Forum, April 30-3.

Halpern, D. F. (1987). Recommendations and caveats. In D. F. Halpern (Ed.) Student Outcomes Assessment: What Institutions Stand to Gain. New Directions for Higher Education, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Hutchings, P. and Reuben, E. (1988). Faculty voices on assessment. Change, 20, (4).

Jaschik, S. (1985, October 2). As states weigh 'value added' tests, Northeast Missouri offers model. Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 18.

Kinnick, M. K. (1985). Increasing the use of student outcomes information. In P. T. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes, New Directions in Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kreider, P. E. and Walleri, R. D. (1988). Seizing the agenda: institutional effectiveness and student outcomes for community colleges, Community College Review. 16, 44-50.

League for Innovation in the Community College (1988). Computerized Adaptive Testing. Laguna Hills, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.

League for Innovation in the Community College (1984). Guidelines for the Development of Computerized Student Information Systems. Laguna Hills, CA: League for Innovation in the Community College.

Lenning, O. T., Lee, Y. S. Micek, S. S., and Service, A. L. (1977). A Structure for The Outcomes of Postsecondary Education. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.

Lewis, D. R. (1988). Costs and benefits of assessment: a paradigm. In T.W. Banta (Ed.) Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research, 59. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McClain, C. J. and Krueger, D. W. (1985). Using outcomes assessment: a case study in institutional change. In P. T. Ewell (Ed.) Assessing Educational Outcomes. New Directions for Institutional Research, 47. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McIntyre, C. (1989). Assessment in Community Colleges. Assessment Update: Progress, Trends and Practices in Higher Education, 1 (1), San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 12-13.

Millman, J. (1988). Designing a college assessment. Performance and Judgment: Essays on Principles and Practice in the Assessment of College Student Learning. Washington, DC: USDE/OERI.

National Governors' Association (1986). Time for Results: The

Governors' 1991 Report on Education. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

National Institute of Education, Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in American Higher Education (1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of American Higher Education. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Paskow, J., ed., (1988). Assessment Programs and Projects: A Directory. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education Assessment Forum.

Peterson, M. W., Cameron, K. S., Mets, L. A., Jones, P. and Ettington, D. (1986). The Organizational Context for Teaching and Learning: A Review of the Research Literature. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Rossman, J. E. and El-Khawas, E. (1987). Thinking about Assessment: Perspectives for Presidents and Chief Academic Officers. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Slark, J. (1988). Learning Assessment Retention Consortium: Student Outcomes Study--Final Report. Santa Ana, CA: Learning Assessment Retention Consortium.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (1987). Resource Manual on Institutional Effectiveness. Atlanta, GA: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges (1985). Criteria for Accreditation. Atlanta, GA: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools.

U. S. Department of Education (1987). Secretary's procedures and criteria for recognition of accrediting agencies. Federal Register, 52 (173), 33906-33913.

Warren, J. R. (1988). Cognitive measures in assessing learning. In T. W. Banta (Ed.) Implementing Outcomes Assessment: Promise and Perils. New Directions for Institutional Research, 59, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILES

Editor's Note: The Steering Committee requested that all members submit a one-page college profile summarizing institutional initiatives in the areas of institutional effectiveness and student success. This section contains all the profiles submitted as of June 8, 1989. The profiles have been edited for standard format and to keep within the one-page limit. Members who have not yet submitted a profile are invited to do so for future updates of this document.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR AUSTIN COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Staff Development

Workshops, Instructional Mini-Grants, Knackademics (The ACC Instructional Development Newsletter), Classified Staff Development, Resource Sharing Programs, and the Faculty Mentor Program which received the "Outstanding Program Award for Excellence in SPOD Programming" from the National Council for Staff, Program, and Organizational Development.

Counseling

AISD-ISD Counselor Liaison, Allied Health Program with local hospitals, Instructor - Counselor Liaison, ACC-ISD Counselor Day of Dialogue, Senior Fair, "Free Workshops for College Success", AISD Project Mentor, Orientation/Student Summer Course, Assessment of Basic Skills and Placement, Advising, Class Visits, Women's Center, Minority Retention Pilot Project, Special Services for the Disabled, Student Organizations and Activities, Job Placement, Minority Transfer Program, and Four-year College On-Campus Recruiting.

Retention Activities

Faculty Retention Survey, Grade Analysis to each Academic Department, Course Withdrawal Report to Each Academic Department, Lonestar Student Information Program, "ACC Steps to Success" model, Early Alert/Mid-Semester Grade Reports, Retention Workshops and conferences.

Adult Career Exploration Services (ACES)

High School and Community Recruitment, Outreach Program, Workshop/Testing for Government and Industry, Liaison with Voc/Tech Programs at ACC and area Universities, and Job Fair.

Financial Aid and Admissions

Target Middle School Project, Texas Alliance of Minority Engineers, College Fair, High School Parent's Nights, and Church Group Projects.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR CENTRALIA COLLEGE

The mission of Centralia College is to develop individual student potential. The college is an open learning community which promotes discovery, development and enrichment for its members and an environment in which students may realize personal growth, enhance skills, test values, and pursue options.

Centralia College offers comprehensive programs which are responsive to technological, economic, and social change. It seeks to develop appreciation for our multi-cultural heritage, social responsibility and citizenship, and personal health and wellness. The college responds to the needs of the community and students it serves by providing:

* Academic courses leading to an associate degree and transfer to a four-year college or university.

* Vocational and technical courses for employment and improved job skills.

* General studies to broaden and deepen knowledge.

* Basic skill development to assure academic success.

* Cultural activities for community enrichment.

* Services and programs which facilitate student success.

* Opportunities for life long learning.

THE CONSORTIUM FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS & STUDENT SUCCESS

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR
TITLE III WASHINGTON STATE COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENT
FOCUSING ON STUDENT SUCCESS

The federal grant is a $2.5 million dollar cooperative grant administered over five years by Centralia College with four other community colleges (Green River, Tacoma, Shoreline, Walla Walla).

The YEARLY OBJECTIVES ARE:

YEAR ONE — To improve success of academically underprepared students through the development and pilot testing of new **ASSESSMENT/PLACEMENT STRATEGIES.**

YEAR TWO — To improve the success of "high risk" students through the design and development of **COMPUTER-ASSISTED ADVISING** and **DEGREE-AUDIT SYSTEMS.**

YEAR THREE — To improve the success of "high risk" students through **INTERVENTION STRATEGIES.**

YEAR FOUR — To promote student success by the development and pilot testing of **NEW LEARNING ASSISTANCE INTERVENTION PROGRAMS** for underprepared students.

YEAR FIVE — To develop an **INSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM FOR STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT.**

Each of the five colleges will annualy receive $82,700 to cooperatively accomplish these objectives.

THE WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE COMPUTER CONSORTIUM will be contracted to design, implement, and train staff for a **COMPUTERBASED SYSTEM** for each campus that meets the **OBJECTIVES** of the grant.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR CLACKAMAS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Summary of Institutional Effectiveness/Student Success Activities

The faculty/staff Student Success Planning Committee was appointed Fall term, 1986. Progress since then on the committee's recommendations includes:

Student Access The new Harmony Center, located near the population center of the college district, provides business and adult basic skills training. In 1987 the Displaced Homemaker/Single Parent program helped 200 women evaluate their skills, build confidence, and begin a job search. Information about student transfer options is now computerized, and the college has signed a transfer agreement with the University of Oregon.

Assessment The CAPP (Computerized Assessment and Placement Program) system provides information on student goals and plans, test scores, and recommended course placements. The Assessment Check Center is required during registration for all students in any English or Math classes who are carrying 8 or more credits.

Advising and Placement CAPP system reports are available to counselors, academic advisors, and other faculty. A new Advising Specialist position will provide additional advising/registration help to students.

Student Intervention Tracking and follow-up with groups of high-risk students is being expanded and improved. Student Success Tips (information on academic help and other services) are published in the daily campus bulletin. A Phi Theta Kappa chapter was chartered Spring term, 1988.

The college received a $2.5 million 5-year Title III grant in 1987-1988. The grant has three major activities: Student Retention, Targeted Learning Program, and Information System.

Other activities which are meeting student and community needs include:

Enrollment A record 24,320 students enrolled in 1987-88. FTE enrollment is up 21% since 1983-84.

Small Business The Greenhouse program and small business management courses provided basic information and support for 167 small business owners in 1987.

Evening Offerings Evening credit offerings produced 26.1% of total 1987-88 credit FTE (20.8% in 1983-84.)

Alternative Education In 1987, 350 students received alternative education through the Tri-City Alternative Schools and the Vocational Options Program.

AutoCAD The drafting program was the second leading Auto CAD training center in the U.S. in 1987.

Guarantee The Clackamas Guarantee insures students course transferability and up-to-date vocational training.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR COLLEGE OF LAKE COUNTY

The College of Lake County, Illinois, has been working on the assessment problem since 1985. In that year, the College began to do extensive research on student learning in basic skills courses in reading and writing. Student learning in the courses was assessed using a pre-test/post-test model, and the students have been followed throughout their coursework. The results look promising.

From Fall 1986 until Spring 1988, an Assessment Task Force was formed to develop college-wide assessment practices. As a result of this committee's work, student satisfaction surveys were evaluated and improved, and two nationally normed examinations, the ACT Comp and the ETS Academic Profile, were evaluated for their correspondence to the College's curriculum and to student learning. In addition, pilot assessment projects were completed in business law and chemistry courses.

Beginning in Fall 1988, the College has formed a committee to conduct a complete review of three essential phases: 1) developing student learning outcomes in writing, speaking, and critical thinking; mathematics; science; social science; and humanities; 2) analyzing the general education curriculum to ensure that it supports the learning outcomes; and 3) developing an assessment program that will evaluate indivdual student progress toward the learning outcomes and support program evaluation on a general level. As this initiative is part of a State of Illinois mandate on assessment, it will be completed by August 1, 1989, and will be implemented over the next five years.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR FLORIDA COMMUNITY COLLEGE AT JACKSONVILLE

The Student Success Project

FCCJ has initiated this fall a three year project that is intended to improve institutional effectiveness as it relates to student success. Three steering committees have been formed are currently working on the three following projects:

A Learning Enhancement and Retention Tracking System (ALERT)

Dr. Charles Dassance, Vice President for Student Affairs & Kent Campus Provost is chairman of this committee. The ALERT system is a computer-assisted tool designed to identify students in need of academic and counseling intervention; to provide feedback and intervention services; and to assist with the college's overall retention program.

College Prep Studies Program

This committee is chaired by Dr. Dennis Gallon, Dean of Liberal Arts and Science and has targeted several initiatives including: To identify the "High Risk" College Prep student; provide appropriate support services; and to re-evaluate the college prep curriculum.

Student Outcomes

The Student Outcomes Steering Committee is chaired by Dr. Bill Martin, Associate Vice President for Instructional Planning and Development. The objectives of this committee include: To evaluate current instructional policies that relate to student outcomes i.e., course grading and attendance policies; to evaluate the success of FCCJ'S graduates, transfers, and program completers; and to evaluate and develop FCCJ assessment strategies and measures for course/program outcomes;

This listing does not constitute a comprehensive description of our activities. In addition to the above, for example, FCCJ has established a Center for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning. This Center is intended to focus on faculty initiated classroom research projects that will lead to advancing innovative teaching and learning strategies. Nine projects have been funded through FCCJ Mini-Grants, and other professional development projects are underway.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR JEFFERSON STATE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Institutional Effectiveness Efforts

Jefferson State's assessment and outcomes activities have, of necessity, been informed by the criteria for institutional effectiveness adopted by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in 1985. Initial efforts have been directed at defining goals/expected educational results and developing of a broad-based institutional planning process.

Although admitting that, ideally, an institution would begin with its mission statement and work downward, developing first institutional expectations, then program expectations, and finally courses and instructional strategies to help students meet those expectations, we began by defining in writing the expectations already in place. Now, through a process of matching, evaluating, and redefining, we are integrating the parts into a coherent whole.

A faculty committee is revising the institutional mission statement with the specific goal of restating it in clear, explicit terms which will lend themselves to later assessment. Representative faculty have identified general education and developmental education competencies; individual faculty have written course competencies and specific objectives for all courses; and program coordinators and/or program faculty have identified existing program competencies.

We are currently engaged in developing program "matches", thus ensuring that the program competencies required of students are supported by course competencies in the program curriculum and that each program provides students with opportunities to acquire the general education competencies.

The college planning process utilizes continuous analysis and appraisal of all college policies, procedures and programs as a basis for developing both long range and short range plans. Responsibility for assessment and identification of critical/strategic issues is assigned to an Administrative Planning Team (APT) composed of the deans and president with involvement at all levels (individual, unit, area and college).

Attention is now being directed towards assessment. A representative institutional effectiveness oversight committee is coordinating the development of an evaluation cycle to insure that all areas of the college are evaluated periodically. Components of this cycle currently under development include a series of collegewide satisfaction surveys and models for evaluating instruction effectiveness.

We plan to have in place by 1993, an integrated planning and evaluation process encompassing all areas of the college: administrative, student development/support and instructional. Our primary goal is to use this process in improving quality and enhancing efforts to fulfill the institution's mission.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR
JOHNSON COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

JCCC Institutional Effectiveness Program

Outcomes: All Programs/Services

- Systematic Program Review
- Economic Impact Study
- College Image Study
- Occasional in-depth research and evaluation projects aimed at specific programs and/or admin/support services

Career & Transfer Programs

- Short-term leavers survey (ed. objectives)
- Long-term leavers survey (ed. objectives)
- Student evaluation of instruction (IDEA)
- Semester Grade-Retention/Attrition Report
- 5-year longitudinal study
- Drop Study (by semester)
- Annual client/user evaluation of library, open labs, resource centers
- Annual Cognitive Outcomes Assess.

Overall Assessment of Effectiveness

Determination of effectiveness based on comparison of results of above reviews, evaluations, reports, etc. against the following standards:

1. Major Published College Documents

   - The college mission statement
   - The college annual master plan

2. Results of Monitoring Local and Regional Environment

   - Periodic needs assessments regarding career programs
   - Continuous monitoring of area demographics, K-12 school enrollments, systematic survey of all area high school students (every four years)
   - Continuous monitoring of current and projected local labor, regional, and national market characteristics
   - Periodic assessment of business and industry training needs
   - Other periodic surveys of constituents including students, community members, potential target populations, etc.

3. Systematic Peer and Other Comparison Data

   - Appropriate national norms (c.f. cognitive outcomes assessment)
   - League for Innovation in the Community College
   - Kansas Community Colleges
   - Members of the JCCC Peer Group Data Exchange

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR KALAMAZOO VALLEY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Current Status of Institutional Outcomes and Assessment Efforts

Kalamazoo Valley Community College is a comprehensive community college located in southwest Michigan enrolling more than 10,000 students per semester. Student outcome and assessment efforts can be seen as falling into one of three distinct categories. These are student attributes, progress, and outcomes.

KVCC collects several types of student attribute information. This is collected prior to enrollment, at the time of subsequent enrollment, and following graduation. Basic demographic information (sex, age, race, and employment) is collected at the point of registration and is updated as needed. Academic characteristics are collected in the form of the ASSET battery of assessment tests (reading, math, and writing) which are administered to all new students planning to complete a specific program. Students are also asked to specify their educational intentions (degree or otherwise) and their primary reason for enrollment (skill improvement or preparation, transfer, or personal interest).

Currently, student progress data at KVCC is limited to the collection of enrollment status and program progress data. Enrollment status (new, returning, transfer, and advanced placment) is collected at the point of admission with additional information (future plans and portion of program completed) collected at enrollment. Further, information regarding enrolled students (new, re-enrollees, and attended prior semester) is calculated independent of student input. Current efforts in the area of student progress include preliminary work toward development of a student tracking mechanism. This will incorporate a cohort approach to retention and will accommodate student intentions (goals) into analyses.

At the present time, KVCC also maintains a limited approach to student outcomes. Graduate employment in positions both related and unrelated to training is measured within one year of graduation. Student satisfaction with courses offered and college services is solicited following graduation. Related to employment, employer satisfaction with KVCC graduates is also examined. At the system level, program graduates and associated trends are examined.

While the activities listed above are fairly exhaustive of the types of data used to assess students, KVCC remains committed to exploring new directions of assessment and outcome that hold the potential for enhancing the educational experience of students.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR LAKE MICHIGAN COLLEGE

Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success

At Lake Michigan College several important steps have transpired that have clearly indicated the college's commitment to institutional effectiveness and to student success. The following elements are currently in place:

1. A clearly established mission and goals statement which speaks to "an assurance of quality" for programs and in people;

2. The adoption of a values statement for the institution which delineates the philosophical premise on how we operate as individuals within the institution and as an institution responsive to its constituency;

3. A strategic planning process that involves all segments of the college;

4. A systematic program review;

5. The adoption of Assurance of Quality agreements for students in any program;

6. The development of a comprehensive instructional program, beginning with the Skill Enhancement concept (see attached article);

7. A commitment to staff and organizational development with $10,000 each year given to special projects presented by faculty and classified and administrative staff that enhance professional or institutional development;

8. Clearly stated CEO management principles presented to each staff;

9. The development of a data base;

10. A Recruitment and Retention study and committee.

These are a few of the efforts that address issues pertinent to the consortium. Following a lengthy self-evaluation, the college received recently for the first time in its history a 10-year accreditation from the North Central Association. This recognition attests to our commitment to institutional excellence and to student success.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR LAKEWOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Developmental Education Courses

Lakewood offers refresher/developmental courses each quarter in mathematics, reading and study skills. While the credits cannot be used to satisfy degree requirements, they do provide preparation for success in the degree credit courses.

Special Needs

With the help of Lakewood's resources, a student can arrange services, such as: close-in parking, signing, tape-recorded books, accommodation of special needs in note-taking and test-taking testing for specific learning disabilities, tutoring, assistance with registration and accommodation of short-term illness.

Assessment Testing

The assessment/placement test is required before registering according to the following: a new student planning to register for 7 or more credits; a new or returning student planning to take a math and/or English composition course for the first time; or a student registering for their 12th cumulative credit.

General Equivalency Development (GED)

The Learning Assistance Center offers a GED examination for those who have not completed high school.

Mathematics Resource Center

Lakewood's Math Center provides students with personal assistance and reference materials in all areas of mathematics.

Tutor Program

The Lakewood Tutor Program provides ten hours of free tutoring per quarter for students enrolled in Lakewood classes. Tutors are fellow students who have obtained endorsement from the course instructor for having expertise in that particular course.

Writing Center

The English Department's Writing Center provides tutorial assistance to students who need help with writing assignments.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR
LANSING COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Comprehensive Quality Assurance Procedures

Lansing Community College appointed a Basic Skills Assessment Task Force which is chaired by the Director of Student Development Services. This Task Force is in the process of developing a College-wide rationale for an approach to basic skills testing/assessment. The Task Force will also recommend for approval the testing/assessment instruments that can be implemented by the College for use at its various registration locations. The Task Force will also recommend which student categories should undergo testing/assessment while at the same time maintaining the College's commitment to open admissions and meeting the needs of adult learners. The purpose of this effort is to strenghen the College's effectiveness in assessing students' basic skills at the "front door," and improving advising, course placement, retention and learning success.

The following activities comprise the Comprehensive Quality Assurance Procedures at Lansing Community College:

1. Update Divisional Review and Planning Documents in the Spring and Summer of each academic year.

2. Review all official Lansing Community College Certificates and degrees annually in June to ensure that they are current and appropriate to the curricula offered across the Institution.

3. Complete Program Review visits annually in the Spring using the criteria agreed upon by President's Council. These Program Reviews are to be data-based when possible, have a quality assurance thrust, and be focused on courses, curricula, and programs.

4. Complete annual quality assurance telephone survey of graduates in late Summer.

5. Complete annual quality assurance telephone survey of students enrolled during mid or late Fall Term. This survey to sample students from across the entire College representing different age, sex, and racial/ethnic categories.

6. Complete annual Winter Term telephone survey of people who attended Fall Term but did not persist during Winter Term. This survey to determine why Students dropped out or stopped out.

7. Conduct follow-up study of transfer students annually during Winter Term. This study to assess the level of academic success experienced by students who have transferred from Lansing Community College to 4-year institutions within the State of Michigan, thereby providing information regarding the quality of L.C.C.'s transfer-preparation education.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR MACOMB COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Assessment and Student Outcomes

Macomb Community College is committed to student learning, and has named Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success as priority focus. We have a number of developing and ongoing activities and a plan to bring them together into a coordinated system.

STUDENT SUCCESS SERVICES:
In its fourth year of implementation, this is a program of services to identify and help those students having academic difficulty.

- Incoming assessment (currently using the ASSET test) of English usage, reading, and mathematics is conducted for all first-time students.
- College orientation sessions to provide information to new students about Macomb's resources and services. Students also learn about the registration process and how to prepare a class schedule.
- Academic advising by a counselor. Appropriate beginning courses are recommended based upon the basic skills assessment results.
- Short-term monitoring (Academic Alert System) provides intervention early in the term for those students identified by their professors as experiencing academic difficulty. At this time, tutoring, counseling, or work with their professor is advised. We are also embarking in a long-term effort to enhance our learning support centers to further assist these students.
- Computerized Program Advising System (CPAS) was implemented in 1988 and provides an individualized plan of work for each student. It designates which requirements have been completed and which courses remain to reach their goal.
- Long-term monitoring will identify students with academic problems repeated over a series of semesters, including low grade point averages and dropped classes. It is to be followed by contact and personalized intervention.

STUDENT OUTCOMES:
The Common Curricular Outcomes Task Force heads a movement to:
Identify and make explicit the intended student outcomes; review and develop or refine strategies and programs conducive to producing the intended student outcomes; develop or refine ways of measuring these outcomes in assessing out institutional effectiveness in producing the outcomes; and to apply the research findings to improve our effectiveness. Other examples include:

- Macomb is one of 15 colleges participating in Alverno/FIPSE national faculty consortium on assessment design for measuring student learning in particular classes.
- Macomb has been invited to be a potential demonstration site for "Institutional Effectiveness Through Outcome Measures" by Project Cooperation, a research effort sponsored by AACJC, National Council of Instructional Administrators (NCISA), National Council for Student Development (NCSD), and the American College Testing Program (ACT).

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR MISSISSIPPI GULF COAST COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Measuring Institutional Effectiveness

In a multi-campus institution, the measures of institutional effectiveness are as varied as the programs, services, facilities, and resources. Maintaining a single entity concept for the College will be strengthened by the focus on institutional effectiveness. Major component of the planning process is the continual evaluation of the institution's purpose, services, facilities, and community. In the last decade, the Institutional Research Office and individual research projects and evaluations have been conducted. Evaluative measures described herein are beneficial in determining the extent to which the College is fulfilling its mission.

Plan for Instructional Review of Educational Programs. In 1985, a Plan for Instructional Review for Educational Programs was adopted. The purpose of the plan is to identify areas where improvement is needed, recognize exemplary programs, provide information for better decision making, establish College-wide standards and propose specific norms for evaluation, and meet requirements for accrediting and funding agencies. A three-year schedule for departmental evaluations was established. By the end of the 1987-88 session, all programs/departments had completed a program evaluation.

Developmental Studies Follow-up Report. An analysis of the developmental education program is conducted. The follow-up report included tracking data to show how well students who took developmental courses succeeded in subsequent academic courses. The evaluation provided each Developmental Studies Program with infomation needed for counseling and advising of students as well as evaluation and improvement of the programs. The study includes both a college-wide overview of student success at MGCCC and individual campus achievement follow-up reports. Students are compared by category of grades along with the number of developmental courses attempted. The results of the study established patterns for predicting student success in subsequent academic courses based on grades received in developmental courses.

The ACT ASSET was given to entering freshmen students (full-time day) to determine placement in the developmental courses (English, Reading, and Mathematics).

University/Transfer Follow-up. In an effort to evaluate the transfer program offerings at MGCCC, a follow-up system was developed to trace MGCCC students to the three major universities in the state. The MGCCC students' performance is compared to the native (one who began as a freshman) university student. Grade Point Average (GPA) is used as the basis for measuring student performance.

An analysis of students' performance by program division allows MGCCC to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses in program offerings.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR MT. HOOD COMMUNITY COLLEGE

MHCC's program for institutional effectiveness is based upon five key elements: (1) vision and mission - clearly defined and founded on student success; (2) thematic leadership - creating, modeling, persisting in visible leadership values; (3) commitment to staff and organizational development - total organizational approach to teaching, learning, renewal, and vitality; (4) valid information and data - open systems for research, diagnosis, feedback, assessment, and organizational knowing; and (5) integrated institutional systems - strategic planning, program review, budget processes, and multiple, cross-staff, ad hoc teams.

The attempt to assure institutional learning was hastened with the establishment of a task force on student success. Representatives from all levels of staff were charged with reviewing all institutional policies and procedures and to recommend improvements to increase the prospects for student success. Numerous initiatives evolved from the work of the task force including: (1) changes in the college's student information system such as the systematic collection of student intent data; (2) new approaches to assessment and placement at entry; (3) a "guided studies" program for high risk students; (4) a new monitoring system for the college's standards of academic progress; (5) an early intervention program; (6) a focus on teaching and learning styles; and (7) major development of institutional support systems, including research, planning, program improvement, budget development, implementation of a new teaching improvement process, small group instructional diagnosis, and a faculty and staff development series.

Quality enhancement goes hand-in-hand with constant innovation. New approaches and curricula innovations implemented at MHCC include: (1) international education across the curriculum; (2) the "mini course" allows for concentrated instruction within courses lasting a few weeks or over a weekend; (3) short-term training options (e.g., Accelerated Secretarial Advancement Program); (4) the wellness program has grown significantly over the last few years with a wide ranging impact, from, meeting general education requirements to staff wellness; (5) targeted instructional programs for special populations and business and industry; and (6) "2 + 2" programs with the local area high schools, there are now in excess of 40 program agreements between MHCC and the high schools.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR PORTLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Institutional Effectiveness and Student Success

Portland Community College has just begun to plan for an integrated, district-wide Student Success Program. Although many pieces of such a program have been in place for a number of years, no unified approach to judging student success and institutional effectiveness has occurred to date.

At the present time, Portland Community College engages in over thirty activities which contribute to student success. Many are provided in enrollment services, in counseling/advising, and in testing. In addition, policies exist or are being adopted related to academic standards and student progress. Finally, the college is making an effort to better record student intent and, hence, to better judge student success.

The College anticipates a broad faculty education project in the 1989-90 academic year. During the winter and spring term of 1988-89, faculty will be asked to describe what information will be used to identify areas of potential resistance, and the education project will direct its attention at these specific areas in 1989-90. Faculty will work with the offices of Enrollment Services, Institutional Research, and Planning as the unified Student Success Program and policies relating to it are developed.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR RANCHO SANTIAGO COLLEGE

Assessment and Student Outcomes Activities

Student outcomes assessment at Rancho Santiago College has traditionally and regularly included the analysis of vocational and transfer student follow-up questionnaires, transfer student progress reports from four-year colleges and universities, and A.A/A.S. degree and certificate trends. The college has a fully staffed institutional research office. Additionally individual academic departments have engaged in student outcomes assessment for departmental accreditation and curriculum development purposes. A current goal of the college relative to outcomes assessment is to better coordinate related functions such as institutional planning, departmental planning, institutional effectiveness assessment, accreditation/self-study, program review, institutional research and evaluating, budgeting, and decision-making. The college is making progress toward this goal with a revised participatory governance structure and an increased level of awareness regarding the need for and purposes of assessment.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR SEATTLE CENTRAL COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Coordinated Studies

In 1984 Seattle Central Community College embarked on a new educational effort that was to prove rejuvenating to faculty and inspiring to students. The college began its first Coordinated Studies Program and with it the creation of "learning communities."

These programs of study, varying from 10 to 18 credits, are taught by teams of three or four faculty members from various academic disciplines. A central theme is chosen and examined by the faculty from each of their educational backgrounds. A major component of the program is seminar sessions in which the students and faculty work as a learning community to discover commonalities, differences or new ideas related to the program theme.

Since its first offering the Coordinated Studies Program has grown so that now seven or eight programs are available to students each quarter. These courses have proven not only effective as instructional devices, but also have a positive effect on retention. "The group process that occurs in coordinated studies teaches students, who are normally 'at risk' that they can learn together. A strong sense of camaraderie and mutual support develops throughout the quarter, " said one developmental instructor.

Retention

In the area of retention, Seattle Central Community College has instituted a number of new strategies. First was the development of a Student Success Manual. The manual consists of various strategies used by faculty, staff, students and administrators that have been successful in helping students succeed in the classroom. Some of the strategies were suggested by college faculty and staff; others were shown by the research to be successful at other institutions.

Seattle Central is also planning to make use of a new report which uses students' grades as a measure of retention. In this case, retention is defined as a student's successful completion of a course. By studying the grades students receive in various courses, the college can identify problem areas; those courses that affect student success (e.g. serial math courses).

In addition to the above, the Retention Coordinator at Seattle Central is developing a series of workshops to be offered in the various divisions/departments outlining how individual employees can make use of various strategies.

RS

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR SINCLAIR COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Sinclair appointed a college-wide steering committee in September, 1988, to study the issues of assessment and develop an institutional plan. A summary of their activities will be available in the near future.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR TACOMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Interest in student success at Tacoma Community College has most recently focused on the college's involvement in a study to evaluate standardized tests of sophomore-level communication, computation, and critical thinking skills.

In the fall of 1987, the Higher Education Coordination Board adopted a master plan that addressed key issues in higher education in Washington state. One of the Board's recommendations dealt with outcomes assessment. It called for an evaluation of institutional performance that included follow-up surveys of graduates and their employers as well as standardized tests for students at the end of their sophomore year. In particular, the recommendation stated that "during the 1987-88 and 1988-89 academic years, institutions will conduct pilot studies to assess the usefulness and validity of nationally normed tests of communication, computation and critical thinking skills to be administered in the last term of the sophomore year" [emphasis added] and that "if the pilot testing period proves that a test of this kind is appropriate, there will be a recommendation that it be adopted; if it proves that a test of this kind is inappropriate, the Board would look for an alternative to provide a systematic external evaluation of institutional performance."

In response to the master plan recommendation, a community college task force on sophomore assessment was formed to design and conduct the pilot study. Task force members include a dean of instruction or dean of students, and a faculty member form seven pilot schools and has been centrally involved in the task force's activities.

The six public four-year institutions in Washington state have formed a similar task force. The four-year task force and the community college task force worked cooperatively on study design and testing methodology.

Three standardized tests designed to measure college-level skills in communication, computation, and critical thinking were selected for evaluation: the ACT College Outcomes Measures Program (COMP), the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), and the College Board Academic Profile. The study's purpose is to evaluate the appropriateness of these tests by examining the results of piloting them on community college sophomores. In short, the study is designed to test these tests.

The tests were piloted on academic transfer students who accumulated at least 70 college-level transferable credits and who earned at least 55 of those credits at a Washington community college. A sample of over 600 students who met these criteria participated in the pilot test program last spring. After taking the standardized test, the students were asked to evaluate the test questions through a set of supplemental questions. In addition, faculty review groups were established to examine the test from two standpoints: 1) the relationship of test questions to college curricula, and 2) the effectiveness with which each test evaluates communication, computation and critical thinking.

INSTITUTIONAL PROFILE FOR VALENCIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

1. The college has established a comprehensive planning/management/evaluation system that includes a comprehensive development plan, which provides goals, objectives, action steps, responsibilities, and proposed outcomes.

2. Each spring a collegewide strategic planning meeting is held to review accomplishments and establish directions for the future. Approximately 80 to 90 faculty, students, administrators, members of the Board of Trustees, and community representatives attend this meeting.

3. The college recently initiated a Collegewide Institutional Effectiveness Committee with several subcommittees and task forces. The purpose of this collegewide effort will be to coordinate the planning and evaluation process to strengthen academic and student services, marketing, strategic planning, assessment, and resource development.

4. A five-year Title III funded retention project is underway, designed to improve student retention and success. The grant focuses on providing orientation and mentoring activities, and designing other strategies to strengthen student retention.

5. A second Title III funded project is being initiated which will focus on articulation between Valencia Community College and the University of Central Florida designed to strengthen student success through the baccalaureate level. Since 85 percent of the A.A. degree graduates from Valencia transfer to UCF, strategies are being designed to provide orientation and training for new and adjunct faculty at both institutions. Informational materials for students dealing with student services/activities and learning resources will be jointly developed to provide continuity for students.

6. An automated degree audit and academic advisement system, are being established that will provide counselors and students with reports of progress in relation to the degree being sought.

7. An automated telephone registration system is being installed to provide better service to students. This service is being combined with dial-up access for registration at various instructional sites throughout the college district.

8. A voice-over-data telecommunications network, which will be established by mid-1989, will provide for direct computer networking between microcomputers on any of the campuses and with the mainframe via either cluster control units or dial-up access.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
NOV 09 1990